FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 243 18 December 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Intention To Continue Geneva Talks Stressed AA 1
[Fedorov in PRAVDA 18 Dec]
Velikhov on Raising Missile 'Invulnerability' AA 4
SDI Program To Bring 'Strategic Chaos' AA 5
[Chernyshev]
'Move Forward' on Chemical Weapons Talks Noted AA 6
U.S. Plans To Continue Nuclear Test Program AA 6
NATO View on Conventional Arms Lead Denied AA 6
[Vasilyev]
LATE REPORT: Government Statement on Nuclear Testing AA 8
[IZVESTIYA 19 Dec]

WORLD & REGIONAL AFFAIRS

UN Adopts Resolution on Peace, Security CC 1
PRAVDA Views International Human Rights Day CC 2
[10 Dec]
Interview With CSCE Delegation Head Kashlev CC 4
[Prague PRACE 10 Dec]
IZVESTIYA Views Mood at Vienna CSCE Meeting CC 6
[Matveyev, Novikov, 11 Dec]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Moscow Discusses CIA Director's Illness A 1
[Agayants]
Briefs: Soviet TV in U.S. A 1

CHINA

Protocol Signed With PRC on Border Rivers B 1
Ryzhkov Message Notes Improving Ties With PRC B 1
[PRAVDA 13 Dec]
Increased Trade, Economic Ties With China Noted B 2

SOUTH ASIA

Pakistani Nuclear Tests 'Serious Threat' D 1
Pakistan Uses Clashes To Quell Opposition D 1
[Pravdin, Andrianov]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Further on Ligachev Visit to Vietnamese Congress E 1
Addresses Friendship Group E 1
[PRAVDA 18 Dec]
Visits Ho Chi Minh Mausoleum E 4
Views Hydroelectric Complex E 4
Meets Laos' Kaysone Phomvihan E 5
Medvedev Addresses Workers E 5
3 SRV Leaders To Step Down; Health Cited E 6
New CPV General Secretary E 6

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Nicaraguan Assembly Grants Hasenfus Pardon K 1
Nicaragua's Ortega on U.S. Intervention, Intent K 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium Meets R 1
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Dec]
Gusev, Afonin Attend TU Congress in Moscow R 2
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 13 Dec]
Officials Sign Obituary of Chernigov Obkom Chief R 2
[PRAVDA 5 Dec]
Yevtushenko Defends Aitmatov, New Novel R 2
Views Religion, Morality R 3
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Dec]
Academic Takes Issue With Yevtushenko Article R 6
[Kaltakhchyan in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Dec]
Director Interviewed on Theater Reform R 12
[Buryakov in IZVESTIYA 5 Dec]
Kiev Commemorates Human Rights Day 10 Dec R 14
[PRAVDA UKRAINY 11 Dec]
TRUD Exposes Corruption in Bolshoy Theater R 15
[Tsitrinyak, 13 Dec]
Society For Links With Expatriates Issues Appeal R 15
[PRAVDA 13 Dec]
Earthquake Registered in Moldavia 17 Dec R 15

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

CSA Issues Jan-Nov Industrial Performance Report S 1
[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 51, Dec]

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Cosmos-1808 Satellite Launched 17 Dec U 1
Tajikstan Ties Into 'Orbita' TV Network U 1
[PRAVDA 5 Dec]

INTENTION TO CONTINUE GENEVA TALKS STRESSED

PM171751 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 86 First Edition p 5

[A. Fedorov article: "Washington's Hypocrisy"]

[Text] The mutual understanding on questions of nuclear weapons -- strategic and medium-range missiles -- reached at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Reykjavik generated great and justified hopes throughout the world. Furthermore, both sides in Reykjavik discussed decisions which, if they were to be implemented, would be of historic -- in the full sense of the world -- importance from the viewpoint of the struggle for nuclear disarmament: It was agreed to eliminate all USSR and U.S. strategic offensive weapons within a 10-year period -- in other words, by the end of 1996. A zero option -- in other words, elimination -- was also envisaged with respect to U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe.

It is known, however, that the positive results of the Reykjavik meeting also generated a different, a directly opposite reaction among certain circles in the West. Some figures in the United States itself, and even in West Europe, frightened of the prospect of a radical lessening of nuclear confrontation and the corresponding easing of international tension, took a course of discrediting the Reykjavik accords and actually dismantling them.

Under these circumstances the Soviet Union, guided by the program for nuclear disarmament by the end of this century which was put forward by M.S. Gorbachev back on 15 January, resolutely urged that Reykjavik's success be consolidated and developed, and that the package of measures aimed at a global solution to the problem of nuclear and space weapons, which took shape there, be transformed into a comprehensive agreement binding on both sides. All that was needed for this purpose was to agree on measures to strengthen the ABM Treaty's provisions in order to block the arms race in space and to agree on the start of talks regarding the complete banning of nuclear tests.

With a view to materializing the positive results from Reykjavik the Soviet side at the Geneva talks submitted on 7 November 1986 a package of interconnected proposals on all aspects of the problems of nuclear and space weapons which were discussed in the Icelandic capital. In order not to slacken the pace and to prepare the ground for constructive progress in the next round, scheduled for 15 January next year, it was proposed to the U.S. side that a working meeting between USSR and U.S. representatives at the nuclear and space weapons talks be held. This meeting took place in Geneva 2-5 December.

What did it produce? Unfortunately, the results of the discussions which took place are disappointing. The point is that while the Soviet side arrived at the meeting with the firm intention to seek and find a way to resolve the questions on which differences still exist, and thus attain the materialization of the solution of the nuclear and space weapons problem which started to emerge in Reykjavik, it became clear that the U.S. representatives were committed to a different approach -- to judge by everything, it had been made incumbent upon them to do everything to distance Washington's present position as much as possible from the Reykjavik accords and to shunt the Geneva talks onto the old unconstructive tracks. And, it has to be said, they spared no energy for this purpose. There were numerous meetings and conversations in Geneva during the first week of December, but they proved fruitless. Because it is impossible to engage in constructive work when the other side at the talks -- the U.S. side -- wants only to liquidate the positive results of Reykjavik.

When talking to journalists now, Max Kampelman, chief U.S. representative at the nuclear and space weapons talks and at the working meeting in Geneva, tries to shift responsibility for the failure of the Geneva working meeting onto the Soviet side. He claims that the Soviet side does not want the destruction of ballistic missiles, advocates a comprehensive solution to the nuclear and space weapons problems, and is against a settlement of differences. But these and other arguments used by Kampelman cannot substantiate his complaints against the Soviet side. They are clearly meant for the ignorant.

Take the question of ballistic missiles. To state that the USSR supposedly does not wish their destruction is to utter a deliberate untruth. The Soviet side is in favor of ballistic missiles, in other words ICBM's and SLBM's, being destroyed by the end of 1996 but, of course, within the context of eliminating the entire strategic triad and not just a part of it. This was the approach -- the elimination of all strategic offensive weapons within 10 years -- that was agreed upon in Reykjavik, and it is this approach, coupled with the pledge on simultaneous nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty, that can ensure equality and equal security for the sides and the maintenance of strategic stability with a sharply reduced level of nuclear confrontation.

But now the United States is talking about eliminating only ballistic missiles. This is not just a gross distortion of the Reykjavik accord in the sphere of nuclear and space weapons. This is a blatant claim to the acquisition of overwhelming military superiority by the United States. On the pretext of destroying the so-called "most destabilizing" nuclear and space weapons -- in other words as if this is in the interests of lessening the military threat -- claims are being made to ensure a decisive U.S. advantage in forces, through heavy bombers and also through forward-based nuclear means including carrier-based aircraft capable of reaching targets on USSR territory. Thus, laments about Soviet objections regarding the destruction of just ballistic missiles instead of all strategic offensive weapons by 1996 cannot be described as anything but hypocritical.

There is an equally hypocritical look to Mr Kampelman's complaints about the package solution to nuclear and space weapons problems proposed by the Soviet Union. The USSR delegation at the Geneva talks adheres precisely to the positions spelled out by M.S. Gorbachev in Reykjavik. And the U.S. side knew from the very beginning that we put forward nothing but a comprehensive solution in the Icelandic capital. This did not produce any reservations at the time.

So why have they now started talking to us about the desirability and even necessity for a separate solution on questions concerning the 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons and the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe? For one single purpose -- to pocket the major concessions made on these questions by the Soviet Union for the sake of reaching agreement, without giving anything in exchange. In other words, they would like to destroy the package of compromises and mutual interests which took shape in Reykjavik for the sake of gaining unilateral advantages for the United States. Thus, progress at the Geneva talks is being obstructed not by the Reykjavik package, but by Washington's continuing pursuit of the dream of military superiority.

Similarly, as regards concrete questions of reducing strategic offensive arms by 50 percent and also eliminating the medium-range missiles of the USSR and the United States in Europe, the present American position is by no means constructive.

Contrary to the results of Reykjavik, Washington is now once again raising the question of imposing additional sublevels for warheads on strategic ballistic missiles, seeking to wreck the established structure of the Soviet strategic forces, and is demanding, without any grounds, the halving of the aggregate throw-weight of Soviet ICBM's and SLBM's, as well as a ban on mobile ICBM's. [paragraph continues]

At the Geneva consultations the U.S. side has not displayed the slightest desire to talk about the question of establishing effective limitations on long-range sea-based cruise missiles, a question which was resolved in principle in Reykjavik. Yet this is necessary in the interests of preventing the bypassing and ensuring the viability of the accord in the sphere of strategic offensive arms.

The Geneva consultations have also demonstrated Washington's clear loss of interest in reaching an accord on medium-range missiles in Europe. How has this been expressed? By the fact that the U.S. representatives now prefer to talk mainly not about medium-range missiles, but about missiles with a range shorter than medium, despite the fact that both in Reykjavik and in Geneva the Soviet Union has clearly proposed that in the course of resolution of the question of eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, a freeze be imposed on shorter-range missiles in Europe and talks be commenced immediately concerning their future. Moreover, the U.S. side formulates its position on shorter-range missiles in such a way as to allow a sharp buildup for the United States, in flagrant contradiction to the task of eliminating nuclear weapons.

Another characteristic feature: As a counterweight to the Soviet proposal not to site medium-range missiles (in Asia for us, and on its own territory for the United States) so that they can reach targets on each other's territory, Washington seeks the right to deploy its medium-range missiles in Alaska, which would result in the emergence of a new source of tension in that part of the world. This, clearly, is evidence of an integrated militarist line, inspired by Pentagon strategists and confirmed in the recent decision to site U.S. Lance nuclear missiles in South Korea. In a word, there is clearly no intention of stopping the export of the U.S. nuclear threat to the Asian-Pacific region. On the contrary, they are working toward extending this practice.

Thus in seeking to pull apart the Reykjavik package Washington politicians would like to drive the Geneva talks into the old pre-Reykjavik impasses, and thereby halt progress toward equal, effective accords. While verbally claiming adherence to the goals of achieving constructive solutions, in practice they are doing everything to wreck such solutions. That is the real meaning of the present U.S. behavior at the Geneva talks. And no two-faced expatiations played to the gallery can conceal this fact.

The American side also continues to engage in obstructionism in the examination of a key question, the strengthening of the ABM Treaty. Here too there is the same hypocrisy. Verbally, agreement is expressed not to use the right to withdraw from the ABM Treaty for a 10-year period, but in practice this is hedged about with stipulations which would negate the aforementioned mutual pledge. First, the agreement not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty is made conditional on the USSR's consent to the elimination by the end of 1996 only of ballistic missiles, which, as we have seen, is fundamentally incapable of forming the basis for a mutually acceptable accord. Second, the pledge not to withdraw is interpreted by the U.S. side so arbitrarily that in effect it turns into its own opposite -- the right to withdraw from the ABM Treaty on any imaginary pretext. Third, the U.S. side does not agree to confine work in the sphere of space ABM defense to within the laboratory walls. Washington has no desire to put restrictions on the SDI program, which is the main obstacle on the path to radical nuclear arms reductions; it seeks the legalization of its "right" to test ABM systems in space.

The U.S. representatives also avoided resolving in principle the question of the commencement of talks concerning a complete ban on nuclear tests.

All these elements of the present U.S. position were the reason why the working consultations in Geneva did not yield a positive result. The Soviet side sought to sound out ways to overcome differences, while the U.S. representatives placed the emphasis on drawing up a list of the differences. This is a pointless occupation. The unresolved questions are already well known. It is important to find a way of settling them, but that was precisely what the U.S. representatives did not want to do, thereby showing that they had no intention of bringing any fresh constructive ideas to Geneva with them.

The question may arise: What next? Will the talks on nuclear and space arms again reach an impasse, despite Reykjavik? Unfortunately it must be admitted that the efforts of the United States and certain circles in NATO are leading to precisely this. And these efforts are being made not only at the talks, but elsewhere. Suffice it to recall that the White House has exceeded one of the key limitations under the SALT II treaty -- on the aggregate number of MIRVed strategic ballistic missiles and heavy bombers with air-based long-range cruise missiles.

However, the Soviet Union does not yield to provocations. We do not intend to break off the talks, any more than we intend to indulge the initiators of new, still more dangerous spirals in the arms race. It is our conviction that the potential exists to avert an unfavorable turn of events and prevent the destruction of the existing treaty base in the strategic arms limitation sphere. Every opportunity also exists to consolidate and develop the positive results of Reykjavik and to resolve radically and in full the problem of nuclear and space arms. We believe that a sense of reponsibility and new approaches to policy will prevail.

It is in this mood and in the expectation of constructive amendments to the U.S. position that the Soviet side is preparing for the next round of talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva.

VELIKHOV ON RAISING MISSILE 'INVULNERABILITY'

LD171710 Moscow TASS in English 1649 GMT 17 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS -- The creation of the SDI is the greatest danger which has ever threatened mankind, holds Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Replying to questions by journalists at a press conference devoted to the publication of the monograph "Space Weapons: Dilemma of Security", the Soviet scientist said the following: "The SDI means placing weapons into space. It is not so important whether they will be nuclear or laser weapons, since the masterminds of the SDI will always find arguments to substantiate an accelerated arms race in space. Therefore, the Soviet Union invariably stands out against its creation.

"The Soviet Union is not engaged in developing strike space weapons and is critical of the position of governments which decided to participate in the SDI programme," said Academician Velikhov. At present there are very many methods and means of verifying the nature of objects and systems, including Soviet ones, placed into space.

At the same time he said that the USSR had quite a number of means capable of raising invulnerability of Soviet missiles. Measures to counter the SDI will be expensive, of course, but nevertheless much cheaper than the SDI programme. They will be probably based on various ways of interception and use of various basing modes.

It was pointed out at the press conference that the realization of the "Star Wars" programme will lead to saturating space with lethal types of weapons, including nuclear arms, and will give an impetus to the race in strategic offensive weapons on earth.

SDI PROGRAM TO BRING 'STRATEGIC CHAOS'

LD172009 Moscow TASS in English 1952 GMT 17 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

Washington stubbornly refuses to join the unilateral Soviet moratorium on any nuclear explosions. One of the main causes being the development in the United States of nuclear weapons of "a third generation," intended, above all, for the Star Wars programme. The U.S. Administration is ignoring the danger coming to the world from militarisation of outer space. The U.S. SDI will lead to disappearance of the very notion of strategic stability, it will bring strategic chaos which is determined by a number of aspects.

First, there is a close interconnection between strategic offensive and defensive armaments, efficient measures of limitation of ABM systems are a substantial factor in restraining the race of offensive armaments and are called upon to lessen the danger of war with the use of nuclear weapons. The violation, the disregard for this interconnection inevitably leads to the disruption of strategic stability.

Second, the bringing into the pattern of strategic forces of a qualitatively new component, which is the broad-scale ABM system with space-based elements, introduces an element of uncertainty into the system of strategic balance, heightens apprehensions of the sides as to emergence of disbalance in the strategic potentials.

Third, strike space armaments, which are considered also as anti-satellite weapons, even provided limited proportions of their deployment, will be destabilising the situation since the sides will not be confident of the reliability and security of their satellite systems of nuclear missile attack warning, systems of control and observation.

Fourth, establishment of broad-scale ABM systems will be a strong stimulus for a quantitative build up of strategic offensive armaments, both delivery vehicles and nuclear warheads. This may refer to intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine ballistic missiles and also to ground and sea-based long-range cruise missiles, the deployment of which it is difficult to control.

Fifth, the development and deployment of the anti-missile system will lead to accelerated development and perfection of systems of counteracting defense, means of breaking it by strategic offensive armaments, that is to the addition of one more fundamentally new element to the strategic equation and, consequently, to its still greater uncertainty.

Sixth, in reply to the development of means of counteracting the ABM system, the sides will develop weapons to combat them (counter-counteraction weapons), which will add the third new element to the strategic equation and will also act as an "amplifier" of its uncertainty.

Realisation of the Star Wars programme will therefore lead to destabilisation of the situation, bordering on a crisis, and will make the situation even more explosive. The SDI is a reckless game also with the security of the United States itself. The Star Wars technology, warn sober-minded American specialists, might one fine day boomerang the United States. The White House and the Pentagon should think over this warning.

'MOVE FORWARD' ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS TALKS NOTED

LD171750 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1647 GMT 17 Dec 86

[Text] Geneva, 17 December TASS -- A regular round in the multilateral talks on banning chemical weapons took place here over recent weeks within the framework of the Disarmament Conference. At the center of the attention of the conference participants were the new Soviet proposals, put forward at the conference in elaboration of M.S. Gorbachev's statement of 15 January 1986. These are proposals on the verification of the nonmanufacture of chemical weapons by commercial industry and on verifications on demand [proverki po zaprosu].

On the basis of the Soviet proposals there occurred in the course of the round the famous move forward in agreeing on certain key questions in the future convention for banning chemical weapons, although on a number of aspects the United States and other NATO countries continue to create artificial difficulties at the talks. However, it is now clear that the Soviet proposals are opening the way to concluding a convention as early as 1987.

To this end, it is necessary, above all, that the other participants in the talks also demonstrate political will and commitment [zainteresovannost], V.I. Israelyan, head of the USSR delegation, emphasized while speaking to journalists. He called on the other parties to step up the work so as not to let slip the apparent opportunity of excluding forever from military arsenals mass-destruction weapons as terrible as chemical weapons.

The next round of talks will open on 12 January.

U.S. PLANS TO CONTINUE NUCLEAR TEST PROGRAM

LD180831 Moscow TASS in English 0813 GMT 18 Dec 86

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Washington December 18 TASS -- The United States is planning to continue the nuclear test programme in the new year despite protests of the world and American public.

THE WASHINGTON POST reported today, quoting informed sources, that "five U.S. tests are planned for the first three months of next year. "Experts said that the 1987 total probably will exceed this year's."

NATO VIEW ON CONVENTIONAL ARMS LEAD DENIED

LD140136 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 13 Dec 86

[Text] In Brussels the final stage has ended [words indistinct] the session of the NATO Council just as the preceding meetings of NATO's (?Nuclear Planning Group) [words indistinct] took place amid claims of an alleged Soviet superiority in conventional armaments. Here is what our defense correspondent Aleksandr Vasilyev writes in this connection:

The prospects of a nuclear-free Europe, a nuclear-free world, that opened up and were discussed in principle in Reykjavik have frightened NATO leaders and made them once again resort to the false claims about an alleged Soviet military menace, this time [words indistinct] in the superiority of the nonnuclear force [words indistinct].

NATO strategists are trying to convince the public that without nuclear weapons the West will come to face the overwhelming superiority of Moscow in conventional weapons, especially tanks.

We must say that the NATO leadership is not playing fair. It juggles with figures and facts for selfish purposes. As a result of this play the defense ministers of the NATO Eurogroup decided a few days ago to step up conventional armaments and put into service next year 275 tanks, 170 planes, new warships, and so forth. It would seem that there is no need to return to what was proved a long time ago, namely that there is a military-strategic parity between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization and that equality in conventional armaments is an inseparable component of this parity. However, in the light of the latest claims made by NATO we are forced to do so, though it is not very easy to determine the exact correlation of forces in conventional armaments.

The comparison of combat-ready divisions can give a certain idea of this. Such divisions are capable of entering hostilities without additional time for preparation. It is true that the total number of such divisions of the Soviet Union is greater than that of the United States. But this is determined by the geographic and strategic location of the Soviet Union and the necessity to guarantee a balance in different regions bordering on it not only in Europe. The land borders of the Soviet Union are over 20,000 kilometers long. However, in Europe 94 NATO divisions are confronted by only 78 divisions of the Warsaw Treaty countries. It should also be borne in mind that in the number of personnel an American or West German division is almost twice greater than a division of the Warsaw Treaty nations. As for tanks, NATO leaders count only those controlled by the joint command of the allies and don't take into account the ones under national command of NATO member-countries. Neither do they include the tanks kept in arsenals that can be brought into action fast. As a result, instead of the actual 25,000 NATO tanks only 12,000 are named. Besides, NATO is known to be superior in anti-tank weapons.

There are a number of examples of seemingly Soviet superiority in other conventional armaments, for example, in tactical planes and helicopters, in artillery and warships. But a serious analysis makes it quite clear that the general balance of forces remains the same and this has been admitted by Western experts. NATO leaders point to the seeming inequality but silence the propoals of Warsaw Treaty countries on the reduction of conventional arms such as cuts by 100 - 150,000 men on both sides in 1 or 2 years. Then, in the early '90s the Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries could further reduce their land forces and tactical aviation by 25 percent as compared with the present level. Such reductions would affect over half a million men on each side. But so far NATO has not responded to these initiatives.

LATE REPORT: GOVERNMENT STATEMENT ON NUCLEAR TESTING

PM181618 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 1

["Soviet Government Statement" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Almost 18 months have passed since the Soviet Union, in its desire to contribute to terminating the dangerous competition in building up nuclear arsenals and desirous of setting a good example to the other nuclear powers, made the decision to unilaterally terminate all nuclear explosions and called upon the United States to join in this action.

Despite the serious costs [izderzhki] which the Soviet Union incurred in terms of its own security by extending the moratorium on nuclear explosions time after time, this unilateral measure played an exceptionally important role in international life. It placed on a practical plane the question of ending nuclear tests and together with it other questions of ending the nuclear arms race. The moratorium demonstrated in practice the possibility of taking steps capable of raising effective barriers in the way of the nuclear arms race.

It is a matter of the deepest regret that the present U.S. Administration has simply failed to respond positively to the USSR's call to join in its peace initiative. Totally ignoring the world community's demands contained in UN General Assembly resolutions, the calls by the Nonaligned Movement, the proposals by the leaders of the "Delhi Six," and the opinion of parliaments and the international public, the United States stubbornly continues to implement its nuclear-weapons test programs.

The United States attempted to camouflage its unwillingness to end nuclear tests by all sorts of "arguments," and in particular references to the impossibility of ensuring effective verification [kontrol] of this measure. It is, however, perfectly clear that this is a far-fetched pretext. The Soviet Union is prepared -- and this has been repeatedly stated at the highest level -- for all most rigorous verification [kontrol] measures in this sphere. Such verification [kontrol] would be fully ensured both by national technical means and by means of international procedures, including on-site inspection. The Soviet Union has expressed readiness to take advantage of the assistance offered by the "Delhi Six" countries in verifying [proverka] the end of nuclear tests. It proposed to the United States that it also examine the question of establishing an international supranational verification [kontrol] network.

The U.S. response to all these constructive steps by the USSR demonstrates most obviously that the real point at issue does not concern verification [kontrol] at all. The true reason for the U.S. side's refusal to join the Soviet moratorium -- and people in Washington can no longer hide this -- is that the United States is openly counting on gaining military superiority over the Soviet Union and the socialist countries by the creation [sozdaniye] of fundamentally new forms and types of weapons. Not only are new nuclear warheads being developed [razrabatyvayutsya] in the course of the nuclear tests conducted by the United States but strike space-based weapons -- nuclear-pumped X-ray lasers -- are also being created [sozdayutsya] in accordance with the SDI program. Work is being carried out to prepare [po podgotovke] a completely new form of weapon capable of hitting targets in space and on earth.

Naturally, if some people wish to develop [razrabatyvat] increasingly sophisticated types of nuclear arms and implement the "Star Wars" program, and extend the arms race to new spheres, a moratorium means nothing to them. It is precisely a refusal to abandon the plans to gain positions of military superiority through space that explains the U.S. Administration's invariably negative attitude to the Soviet Union's proposals to start fully worthwhile talks which could ban nuclear tests forever.

There is still no sign that the United States is ready to follow the USSR's example and abandon the conducting of nuclear explosions. Moreover, the rate of implementation of U.S. nuclear test programs remains at the previous high level. During the time that the moratorium has been in effect, while silence has reigned at Soviet test sites, the United States has carried out 20 officially announced and 4 unannounced nuclear weapon tests.

Under conditions in which the United States is stubbornly continuing to implement its nuclear test program with a view to creating [sozdaniye] new nuclear arms and building them up, the Soviet Union cannot display one-sided restraint forever. A situation has taken shape which, if continued, is fraught with the danger of serious damage to the USSR and its allies.

After a deep and comprehensive examination of this question the Soviet leadership considers it necessary to state the following.

First. The Soviet Union again proposes the immediate starting of full-scale talks on the total prohibition of nuclear tests. It is prepared to conduct such talks at any level and at any forum, with the United States participating, of course. In the course of these talks verification [kontrol] questions must also be resolved in such a way as to ensure reliable compliance with an agreement on this score. In the process of talks on the complete prohibition of nuclear explosions, the Soviet Union would also be prepared to seek agreement on a phased solution to this task, having in mind the ratification of the 1974 and 1976 Soviet-U.S. treaties and the introduction of interim limitations on the quantity and yield of nuclear explosions.

Second. The USSR is prepared to continue to adhere to its moratorium. However, it will resume nuclear tests after the very first U.S. nuclear explosion in the coming year. [SSSR gotov priderzhivatsya svoyego moratoriya i dalshe. Odnako on vozobnovit yadernyye ispytaniya posle pervogo zhe yadernogo vzryva SSAhv nastupayushem godu.]

Third. If the United States ends nuclear tests, the USSR, on any day or in any month, will be ready to halt the implementation of its program of such tests on the basis of reciprocity.

The decision on the ending by the Soviet Union of its moratorium after the first U.S. nuclear explosion in the coming year is a measure which has been forced upon it, dictated exclusively by security interests. The USSR remains a committed supporter of the complete ending of all nuclear tests as a most important priority measure in the matter of achieving the main objective -- the curbing of the nuclear arms race and the subsequent complete elimination of these arms. As before, the USSR will strive vigorously for the achievement of this objective. It is convinced that its position on this question will meet with due understanding and support from all the peace-loving forces of our planet.

UN ADOPTS RESOLUTION ON PEACE, SECURITY

LD051400 Moscow TASS in English 1246 GMT 5 Dec 86

[Text] New York December 5 TASS -- The 41st session of the United Nations General Assembly has adopted a resolution on the "establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security" submitted for its consideration by the group of the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union. The resolution takes into account the opinion of many U.N. member countries which took part in the discussion of this issue. It sets out main directions of establishing a system of comprehensive security for all, stresses the role of the U.N. and provides for the continued discussion of the question at the next session of the General Assembly. The groundwork has thus been laid for the further extensive constructive dialogue with regards to the essence of the new philosophy of security in the nuclear-space age and practical ways for restructuring international relations on its basis. 102 votes were in favour of the resolution. The United States and France alone voted against. 46 delegations abstained (NATO members and some other countries). Following is the text of the resolution:

Establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security [subhead]

The General Assembly,
Deeply concerned at the tense and dangerous situation in the world and the danger of continuing down the path of confrontation and the arms race towards the abyss of the nuclear self-destruction of mankind,
Deeply concerned at the numerous threats to international peace and security resulting from the persistent violations of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations,
Reaffirming the important role of the United Nations as an indispensable forum for conducting negotiations and achieving agreements on measures to strengthen international peace, security and cooperation and to democratize international relations,
Having in mind the necessity to strengthen international cooperation on the basis of existing consensus with a view to promoting the well-being and economic development of all countries, in particular developing countries,
Having discussed the question of a comprehensive system of international peace and security,

1. Solemnly reaffirms that the collective security system embodied in the Charter of the United Nations continues to be a fundamental and irreplaceable instrument for the preservation of international peace and security,
2. Also reaffirms the need to adhere strictly to the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations, especially respect for the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of states, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs, non-use of force in international relations, peaceful settlement of disputes and the right of all peoples to self-determination,
3. Recognizes the invaluable role of the United Nations in the preservation of international peace and security, harmonization of the policies of the member states and the imperative need to strengthen and reinforce the United Nations,
4. Calls upon states to focus their efforts on ensuring security on an equal basis for all states and in all spheres of international relations,
5. Calls upon member states to make their contribution to practical measures to ensure compliance with an implementation of provisions of the Charter with particular regard to the crucial and interrelated areas of disarmament, crisis and conflict settlement, economic development and cooperation, the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms,
6. Further calls for the implementation of resolutions of the United Nations,
7. Decides to continue consideration of this question at its forty-second session under an item entitled "comprehensive system of international peace and security".

PRAVDA VIEWS INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

PM161445 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 86 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Human Rights"]

[Text] In December 1966 the United Nations adopted the international human rights conventions. The 20th anniversary of this important event is currently being widely marked throughout the world. Today, on Human Rights Day, it must be especially emphasized that the practical implementation of these rights and freedoms is inseparably linked with the solution of the most pressing problem of the present time -- the preservation and consolidation of world peace.

The concept relating to humanitarian questions proclaimed by the 27th CPSU Congress embodies the foremost ideals of social justice and is an integral part of the comprehensive system of international peace and security put forward by the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist community states have every reason to be proud of their contribution to the cause of the practical implementation of human rights and freedoms. The USSR acted as the initiator in the adoption of the international human rights conventions by the United Nations. And these rights are put into practice in our country and the other socialist states.

Respect for human rights ensues from the very essence of the new society. The socialist system can develop successfully only when the people themselves actually manage their affairs and the affairs of their country. Without the further development of socialist democracy and all its aspects it is not possible to achieve the accelerated development of our society. Thus, whereas the human rights question is often the subject of political speculation and hypocrisy for certain representatives of capitalist states, under socialism the problem of the translation of human rights into reality is an invariable precondition for society's successful progress toward its lofty ideals.

The Soviet Union is not just a signatory of all the major international agreements on human rights. It has initiated many of them, including the Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Our country has issued an appeal for the right of nations to self-determination, basic socioeconomic rights, and a number of other fundamental propositions to be embodied in the conventions. Convincing evidence of the Soviet Union's loyalty to the human rights ideal is the inclusion of all the 10 principles of the Helsinki Final Act in the Fundamental Law of our country, which has invested them with the power of a supreme legislative priority.

"Democracy manifests itself above all in the fundamental question of war and peace," V.I. Lenin noted. Indeed, how can the words about democracy be reconciled with the actions of the leaders of the states which engage in a frenzied race in nuclear, space, chemical, and other types of mass destruction weapons and kindle hostility between peoples? But this is precisely the kind of policy conducted by the imperialist circles of the United States and some other NATO countries. How can you talk about genuine human rights in a situation where preparations for a nuclear war which threatens to reduce everything to ashes call into question the paramount human right -- the right to life.

Resolutely combatting the threat of nuclear war and constantly advancing new specific and realistic initiatives aimed at building a nuclear-free world and firmly establishing relations of peaceful coexistence and broad cooperation between all countries and peoples, the CPSU and the Soviet state are defending man's most fundamental rights with practical actions.

What question of genuine democracy can there be in a situation where millions upon millions of people are condemned to unemployment, homelessness, and racial and national oppression; where they are subjected to persecution for thinking freely; where they are deprived of their right to education, medical and social assistance, and frequently their simple right to a crust of bread. A society where the individual is misled by the propaganda of war, militarism, and violence, a society in which hatred of other peoples is cultivated and racist, fascist, and revanchist ideas are propagated, is a society in which rights are flouted.

The imperialist politicians' oaths of loyalty to human rights -- politicans who support the fascist regimes in Chile and Paraguay and arm the Israeli Zionists who commit crimes on Arab territories -- are pure hypocrisy. The state terrorism which the U.S. ruling circles have transformed into the norm of their foreign policy is guiding the hand of the mercenary cutthroats who kill women and children in Nicaragua, encouraging those who stifle democracy in South Korea, El Salvador, and Pakistan, and making the South African racists even more brazen.

At the conference in Bern, the USSR proposed that steps be taken to ensure that all states bring ther internal legislation regulating humanitarian problems into line with international standards and declared its readiness to be guided in practice by the draft elaborated by experts in respect of these questions. As is known, Washington thwarted the adoption of this document. Furthermore, the United States has also failed to ratify dozens of documents which make up the system of present-day international law obligations adopted by many states.

Yet after all this, the gentlemen from Washington would like to accuse the Soviet Union of violating human rights! Anti-Sovietism is not only blinding the U.S. ruling elite; it also presents a serious obstacle in the path of the normalization of the internatonal situation. The U.S. Administration, complying with the interests of the military-industrial complex, is thwarting the resolution of the problem of nuclear disarmament and blocking the implementation of the accords achieved at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik.

Soviet people resolutely condemn the imperialist practice of flouting human rights. The Soviet Union believes that a considerable number of problems pertaining to the cooperation of states and peoples in the humanitarian sphere have accumulated which demand not only close attention but also a new approach and new way of thinking in line with the demands of the nuclear and space age. In the light of this, the USSR has proposed that a representative conference of participant states of the All-European Conference be convened to discuss the whole range of these questions, including contacts between people and questions relating to information, culture, and education. Moscow is prepared to host such a forum.

In putting forward this proposal, the USSR is guided by lofty humanitarian considerations. We are proposing an all-around discussion aimed at the achievement of practical results in order to establish mutual understanding which would open up the possibility to improve the situation in the humanitarian sphere in all countries which participate in the all-European process.

The year 1986, which was declared International Peace Year by the United Nations, is drawing to a close. It has been marked by the further intensification and expansion of the struggle for peace in all parts of the planet. The Soviet Union's sincere desire is to ensure a simultaneous buildup of efforts to ensure human rights worthy for all the inhabitants of the earth.

INTERVIEW WITH CSCE DELEGATION HEAD KASHLEV

AU151533 Prague PRACE in Czech 10 Dec 86 p 5

[Interview with Yuriy Kashlev, head of the Soviet delegation to the CSCE follow-up meeting in Vienna by Milan Syrucek: "The USSR and Human Rights" -- in Vienna, date not given; initial paragraph is paper's introduction]

[Text] The third follow-up meeting of the Helsinki process continues its work after the departure of the ministries of foreign affairs -- in the plenum as well as in three working groups. With brief pauses, its deliberations are to last to the end of July at least. After assessing the results achieved since Madrid, it is to concentrate on drafting the program up to the fourth follow-up meeting as determined by the Final Act of the Helsinki conference. Thus far, every follow-up meeting has reflected the complexities of the international situation in which it was held. What, then, was the start in Vienna like? How can we assess what has been said in the Hofburg Palace until now? This is the question with which we began the interview with Yuriy Kashlev, the head of the Soviet delegation.

[Kashlev] The Vienna meeting has begun in normal, nay, even in more favorable conditions than was the case with the preceding follow-up meeting in Madrid. This was reflected in the speeches of practically all 35 ministers of foreign affairs of the participating countries. A very important prerequisite for this was the fact that a joint proposal of the socialist countries was adopted to begin this meeting on the level of ministers of foreign affairs, that is, on a political level. This made it possible to immediately ascertain what the individual countries have come to Vienna with. All speakers identified themselves with the Helsinki process -- even the U.S. secretary of state was forced to do that. All speakers highly valued this process and at the same time favored its further development. In a number of the ministers' speeches ideas cropped up which the individual states will be submitting as concrete proposals in the further course of the meeting. They pertained to trade-economic relations as well as humanitarian issues. Although in the military-politicl sphere no concrete proposals have been submitted, all agreed that it is necessary to continue what has been achieved in Stockholm -- be it the measures aimed at strengthening trust or going to disarmament issues for the further stage of the Stockholm conference.

[Syrucek] Thus it is possible to say that the meeting is taking a truly normal course, without fluctuations such as those that cropped up in Madrid?

[Kashlev] Yes, with only one exception: The U.S. delegation pursues a clearly provocative line. It avoids issues of security and disarmament, but even more strenuously it concentrates on only one theme -- interference in the internal affairs of other states under the pretext of human rights. This line clearly differs from the speeches of all the other representatives, and its obvious objective is to get the Vienna meeting into a position of confrontation at its very beginning.

[Syrucek] At the same time it is remarkable that it was precisely the USSR who proposed at the Vienna meeting that a forum on human rights be convened in Moscow. What made you do that?

[Kashlev] I would like to redefine this: In Moscow, we want to hold a representative conference on an entire complex of issues of a humanitarian nature. Why? Many foreign observers have already noted that quite new approaches to humanitarian problems have cropped up in the USSR of late. When the 27th CPSU Congress elaborated an entire set of proposals pertaining to international security, it also determined -- for the first time on such a high level -- four fundamental directions of the Soviet foreign policy: military, political, economic, and humanitarian. [paragraph continues]

By doing this, we have officially put humanitarian issues on the same level with the most important problems of international politics. There are simply no longer three elephants on which foreign policy rests, but four. This is not a cyclical approach, but a profound understanding of the fact that in our times humanitarian relations among states and nations are greatly developing, and thus influencing other aspects -- military, political, and economic -- and that it is necessary to attach an equal importance to them. This is the philosophy of our approach to these issues.

[Syrucek] Has this been influenced by the internal process now underway in the USSR?

[Kashlev] It is obvious that this apprach to domestic humanitarian relations is closely interconnected with the internal process -- with democratization, deepening and expanding our citizens' social and other personal rights, openness, and with the flow of information [informovanost]. From these roots grows our attitude toward internationl humanitarian rights, human rights, contacts among people, and the like. The long-term process which the party proclaimed is quite profound. It enables us to much more actively approach these issues at internatinal forums. But, on the other hand, it also enables us to much more categorically expose those who pass themselves off as standard-bearers of human rights, but who in substance violate them most. The new openness [glasnost] constitutes a new offensive against lies in this issue too. This, too, was the reason why our leadership has decided to submit to the Vienna meeting the proposal to convene in Moscow a conference on human rights, which would solve them comprehensively.

[Syrucek] Here, in the backstage [v kuloarech], doubts have cropped up whether the USSR will not become frightened of a confrontation of views on these issues.

[Kashlev] I am saying it openly: We are not afraid and are ready for a serious talk on human rights. If there is still something we have not done in that sphere, we are getting ready to do it.

[Syrucek] Do you mean by that, for example, the recent new legal measures?

[Kashlev] Yes. For example, a new measure has been adopted on departures from the USSR and on arrivals to our country, which will go into effect on 1 January and was already published in the collection of government resolutions. It markedly expands the possibilities of Soviet citizens' leaving to go abroad for family reasons, that is, to visit close and more distant relatives, for various family events, and even, for example, pay a visit to graves. The possibilities of arrivals in our country are being equality expanded. A new instruction pertaining to contracting marriages with foreigners, also taking international obligations into consideration, is being prepared. I want to say that much work in general is being done so that our administrative measures are in harmony with international obligations. It was the USSR, after all, who proposed at a conference in Bern that all states participating in the Final Act obligate themselves to such a procedure. And, as is known, it was the United States who blocked the adoption of such a document! On this issue, too, we are putting our house in order and are striving for a democratic, open, and liberal approach to these issues; and we are not afraid of talks on that theme. Should this conference materialize, and thus far it seems that views on it are more or less positive, we will appear at it with an open heart.

[Syrucek] But the Danish delegation also submitted a similar proposal...

[Kashlev] The purpose of the Danish proposal is to create some sort of permanent body which would follow the observance of human rights in individual countries. Similar to how the Stockholm conference decided about on-site inspection in some military issues, this Danish proposal presupposes the creation of on-site inspection to check how human rights are being observed. From the consultation we held with other delegations, the feeling arises that -- first -- this proposal is not very clear and -- second -- it is fairly doubtful: Who is going to determine what places in what countries are to be visited? How would one analyze whether this or that country observes or does not observe human rights? And what actually would be studied -- some individual cases, or unemployment, or the status of the original population, for example, in the United States? It is my opinion that our idea is simpler and clearer: Experts will meet -- and not only diplomats, but, above all, experts on individual issues concerning human rights -- and will assess them and arrive at certain conclusions and proposals for cooperation. But verifying through inspection if human rights are being observed? That can be done with military maneuvers, because they concern a limited number of people in a limited space and limited time, but human rights concern every human being, all mankind. And it is not understood what should actually be checked.

[Syrucek] What is your opinion about some obvious provocations committed here by some delegations -- above all the U.S. delegation -- for example, by inviting Yuriy Orlov who recently emigrated from the USSR here to Vienna. By incessantly repeating the issue of the so-called Jewish immigration from the USSR and the like?

[Kashlev] At practically all European consultations the American delegation begins by dragging to the sponsoring country representatives of a great number of antisocialist, anti-Soviet, Zionist, and other organizations, dissidents, and the like. They assemble all these anti-Soviet moaners around the conference, and at the conference itself they make provocative statements about how people are being locked up in our country for their political views (they call them "prisoners of conscience") and remind everyone of other things (such as the case of the jazz section in Czechoslovakia) with an obvious attempt to provoke a sharp response and thus go over to confrontation. However, we will not let ourselves get carried away by that; we respond to attacks, but -- above all -- we strive for a constructive approach and submit positive proposals for mutual cooperation.

IZVESTIYA VIEWS MOOD AT VIENNA CSCE MEETING

PM121255 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by special correspondents V. Matveyev and N. Novikov: "Vienna: Soviet Initiatives Set the Pace"]

[Text] Vienna -- The first weeks of the Vienna meeting's work have received the following assessment in the influential local newspaper DIE PRESSE: "So far," it wrote, "the Soviet Union has undoubtedly set the pace of the talks... The USSR's most impressive initiative was the invitation to participate in a conference on humanitarian questions in Moscow."

The 35 countries participating in the meeting are discussing an extensive range of questions. This was also the case at the previous meetings in Belgrade and Madrid. What, then, characterizes Vienna? Now that the first weeks of the meeting are behind us, we can confidently state that the atmosphere of its sessions compares favorably with the previous forums.

The persistent efforts made by constructive diplomacy have made it possible to come to the Vienna meeting with good baggage in the form of the accords already reached (at the Stockholm conference) or the possibilities which came to light (at the Reykjavik meeting) for important new agreements on key security issues -- in the sphere of real disarmament measures on our continent.

Some of the Western participants in Vienna have even started speaking of an "excess" of opportunities in this sphere, as if there could be a concept of "excessive security!"

Of course, before conditions of lasting security and cooperation are created within the framework of the whole continent -- from the Atlantic to the Urals -- we still have to travel a long and difficult path in various spheres: political, military, economic, humanitarian. The participants in the Vienna meeting are engaged in discussing the whole package of such problems and questions. They will soon break for the New Year's recess and will then resume the debate, concentrating attention on examining the proposals and recommendations on further action in all these important spheres of virtually equal worth. For there cannot be genuine security without solving the package of problems relating to all the main spheres of modern life.

At the previous forums in Belgrade and Madrid, certain Western delegations, particularly the U.S. delegation, tried for speculative and unscrupulous purposes to ascribe to the socialist countries' delegates a "lack of attention" to the humanitarian sphere. Then, too, such fairytales were totally groundless.

This time, right from the start of the Vienna forum, it was the delegations of the United States and its close partners that had to immediately reorganize themselves and hastily formulate a common stand on the USSR delegation's proposal to convene in Moscow a representative conference on the entire package of humanitarian questions. The U.S. delegate promised to reply to that proposal "in due course..."

So, on the one hand there is a far from quick reaction and, on the other, those same representatives "scurry about" when they seek to create the impression that there is no one in the world more concerned about human rights than they are. Congressman Steny Hoyer, who also holds the office of deputy head of the U.S. delegation, has been particularly persistent in this regard. As can be seen, the fact that Congress itself just cannot ratify the UN convention on humanitarian questions adopted back in the mid-sixties does not even embarrass this delegate.

Of course, the U.S. delegation includes no representatives of American organizations that come out in defense of the Negro population's civic rights, in defense of peace, in defense of those who have lost their jobs or housing... What would they say after listening to the congressman? On the other hand, a renegade who represents no one but himself was invited to join the same U.S. delegation.

At the press conference given recently by W. Zimmerman, head of the U.S. delegation, a journalist asked whether it will be possible in the future to incorporate the provisions of the Final Act in U.S. legislation. W. Zimmerman acknowledged that the Soviet Union has already done so. But in the United States, according to him, there is the "Bill of Rights." Let us recall that this bill was adopted almost two centures ago. Life has made great strides since then. What is more, the bill's main provisions remain just good intentions.

The transatlantic champions of human-rights discourse readily on this problem but close their eyes to the most obvious facts. Unemployment in the United States? This, you see, is "the consequence of prosperity in the country of individual freedoms'! Yes, yes, that is just what Richard Schifter, the U.S. spokesman at an Ottawa conference of experts, declared on 25 May last year.

Emigration to Israel... How much fuss has been made in the West with regard to this! But then a group of former Soviet citizens who have experienced the "charms" of life in Israel appeared before journalists in Vienna. They eked out a miserable existence in the "promised land," worked 14-16 hours a day, lacked elementary living conditions, and came up against a mocking attitude toward them on the part of the Israeli authorities. They declared that many former Soviet citizens living in Israel dream of returning to the motherland.

Representatives of the major Western newspapers and television companies displayed very minimal interest in that press conference. No wonder: The facts cited there are not to the liking of those who irresponsibly speak about "freedom of information." It evidently was no coincidence that Washington rejected a proposal to hold a televized debate between Soviet and U.S. parliamentarians. A similarly negative response came from the other side of the ocean to the idea of a televised debate between the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state. Whose, then, one wonders, is the "closed society"?

Lies fear publicity. That has long been known. While posing as "judges" of other countries and peoples for the purpose of fanning an atmosphere of "psychological warfare," the authors of forgeries retire as soon as soon as the conversation turns to the humanitarian problem in its true concept and scale. The West would like to divert these problems from the mainstream into the narrow backwater of fuss over a handful of renegades and to turn the human rights question into a tool of confrontation. These gentlemen go so far as to claim that, until there are "fundamental changes" in the socialist countries, the arms race must continue. Thus the last pitiful fig leaves of the disguise to which the imaginary champions of "human rights" resort fall away.

Humanitarian issues occupy a worthy place at the Vienna meeting. But they must be discussed and resolved not in the spirit of confrontation and "psychological warfare" but in the name of progress in this important sphere. The Soviet Union is ready for this and urges Western states to support this businesslike, constructive approach.

MOSCOW DISCUSSES CIA DIRECTOR'S ILLNESS

LD172231 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Dec 86

[From the "International Diary" program; presented by Nikolay Agayants]

[Text] Reports from Washington say that William Casey, who is hospitalized, is in stable condition and spent his day very well. Viktor Levin reports:

[Levin] William Casey, the chief of the subversive and dirty operations department -- as the Central Intelligence Agency is referred to quite justly, was to give evidence on Tuesday, that is, yesterday, in the special Senate Intelligence Committee, which is examining the "Irangate" circumstances: That is how the scandal is called over secret arms sales to Iran by the United States and the handing over of the money gained from this to the Nicaraguan contras and Afghan bandits. Although I highly doubt the intention of the above Senate committee to unravel all the roots of this dirty operation and to name the culprits, the fact that Casey did not at all feel like discussing with the senators these delicate questions does not cause any doubt. After all, he could not remain silent, and the questions might have turned sharp. And so, the CIA chief found the way out. On Monday he reported sick and was urgently sent to hospital. Theoretically, he may well be doing poorly. Seventy-three years is not an infantile age and furthermore the CIA says Casey suffers from hypertension. So, I repeat -- he might have been ill. But in this case I am getting the impression that the illness is of a diplomatic nature, and, having reported his ailment, he escaped the sensitive meeting of the Senate committee.

Why am I developing such an impression? Well, judge for yourselves. The CBS television company, referring to doctors, reported that Casey suffered two heart attacks. NBC, this is the second largest television company in the United States, claimed at the same time that Casey had two minor fainting fits. Several minutes later another correspondent of the same television company defined more precisely that the faintings were connected with blood vessel spasms in the brain. So, what was wrong with Casey -- heart attacks or a fit? Incidentally, the very same reporter who gave the reasons for the fits noted that lately Casey -- and I quote -- experienced "a heavy emotional burden" in connection with the Iranian scandal and the need to give explanations to the Senate for hours on end. And this, it seems to me, is the main reason. Furthermore, today, as we have said, Casey is feeling more stable in the hospital and the doctors are even pointing to his excellent spirits. And why shouldn't he be pleased if he is inaccessible to Congress and has avoided unpleasant questions?

And during this time, other members of the Senate committee will find another victim. There is already talk in Washington that, in place of Casey, the case of Regan, the White House chief of staff, will be heard, if, of course, he is not urgently taken to the hospital as well. After all, nobody wants to answer for the secret weapons sales to Iran and the scandalous machinations associated with this.

BRIEFS

SOVIET TV IN U.S. -- The Soviet State Committee on Television and Radio Broadcasting and the Orbita Technologies Corporation of New York have signed an agreement on a test show of the second channel of Soviet television in the United States. The vice president of the corporation, Viktor (Kholenko), has said in an interview that American televiewers will have a change of seeing broadcasts in full and not selected features as often was the case in the past. The test show will last for 2 weeks. [Text] [Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 17 Dec 86 LD]

PROTOCOL SIGNED WITH PRC ON BORDER RIVERS

LD181010 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0730 GMT 18 Dec 86

[Text] Beijing, 18 Dec (TASS) -- The first session of the Soviet-Chinese commission to give guidance on formulating a scheme for the comprehensive use of border sections of the rivers Argun and Amur has taken place in Beijing. This commission was set up in accordance with an agreement between the governments of the two countries.

Specific questions connected with the implementation of bilateral accords have been examined. A protocol that has been signed states that, in the interest of the development of the national economy of both countries in this region, the scheme examines options for the use of water resources of the Argun and the Amur, as well as the most important facilities to be constructed in areas that include hydropower engineering, protection against floods, irrigation, navigation, protection of water resources, and fishing. The protocol stresses that priority in these areas will be given to cooperation in the sphere of hydropower engineering, municipal water supplies, and the protection of land against flash floods.

The Soviet delegation, led by Polad Polad-Zade, USSR first deputy minister of land reclamation and water resources, was received by Qian Zhengying, PRC minister of water conservancy and electric power.

We are pleased with the work of the joint commission, Qian Zhengying said in a conversation with journalists. She noted that there are good prospects for Soviet-Chinese cooperation in the areas that have been mentioned. The implementation of the accords that have been reached, she said, will facilitate further development of cooperation between the USSR and the PRC.

RYZHKOV MESSAGE NOTES IMPROVING TIES WITH PRC

PM151151 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 86 First Edition p 1

["Greetings Message to Visitors to the USSR Trade and Industry Exhibition in the PRC" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] I cordially greet the visitors to the USSR trade and industry exhibition in the PRC -- the biggest Soviet exhibition in China for more than 30 years.

In recent years there has been an appreciable improvement in relations between the Soviet Union and the PRC: Multifaceted ties are expanding, trade is increasing, and economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation is developing. The level of mutual contacts between the two countries' representatives is rising. The Soviet Union is ready to continue strengthening mutual trust and developing good-neighborly ties and mutually advantageous cooperation with the PRC in the interests of the two countries' peoples and of the cause of peace and socialism.

We believe that there are broad opportunities for developing bilateral relations. It was pointed out at the 27th CPSU Congress that the reserves of our cooperation are tremendous. The Soviet people perceive with respect the aim advanced by the CPC of modernizing the country and building a socialist society under conditions of peace. We are sure that the further development of Soviet-Chinese ties in various spheres and the mutual exchange of experience of socialist building will promote the implementation of our countries' creative plans.

In the summer of this year Soviet people familiarized themselves, with great interest, with the PRC trade and economic exhibition in Moscow that demonstrated your country's achievements. We hope that the USSR trade and industry exhibition in Beijing will give the Chinese people an opportunity to learn more about the Soviet Union's successes and will serve the cause of broadening bilateral ties between the two states and strengthening good-neighborliness and cooperation.

On behalf of the USSR Government I express gratitude to the PRC Government and to all Chinese organizations for assisting in organizing the exhibition.

I wish the Chinese people new successes in socialist building, peace, and prosperity.

N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

INCREASED TRADE, ECONOMIC TIES WITH PRC NOTED

OW160237 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0400 GMT 15 Dec 86

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpts] Since the founding of the PRC, trade, economic ties, and scientific and technical cooperation between the Soviet Union and China reached their climax at the end of the 1950's, Regretfully, these gradually began to decline, and practically dropped to zero at the end of the 1960's. New developments in trading and economic relations between the Soviet Union and China started in the early 1980's. The agreements signed by both sides with regard to economic cooperation are of great significance in promoting trade between the two countries. The volume of trade between the Soviet Union and China rose by 8 times from 1981 to 1985. [passage omitted]

Meetings between the Soviet fired vice chairman of the Council of Ministers and China's vice premier were held in 1984 and 1985. As a result, a series of important agreements was signed, including the 1986-1990 barter and payments agreement. On the basis of this agreement, the volume of trade during the 5-year-plan period will reach 12 billion rubles. In 1990 alone, the volume of trade will reach 3 billion rubles. Machinery, industrial equipment, and means of transportation are major export commodities. For example, the Soviet Union supplied China with 40,000 trucks and cars in 1985. [passage omitted]

The Soviet Union also exports ferrous and nonferrous metals, lumber, and chemicals to China, while importing tungsten, raw materials, light industrial products, and food. Today, both the Soviet Union and China are tackling issues to promote socioeconomic developments. This will create a prerequisite for expanding economic and trade relations between the two countries. Here we would like to quote the remark made by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 17th CPSU Congress: Thinking of the future, one can say that the reserves for cooperation between the USSR and China are enormous. They are great because such cooperation is in the interest of both countries and because that which is most dear to our peoples -- socialism and peace -- are indivisible.

PAKISTANI NUCLEAR TESTS 'SERIOUS THREAT'

LD172321 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English 1400 GMT 5 Dec 86

[Text] It has been learned that Pakistan has again tested a special detonator for nuclear bombs, the third this year, and that it has attained a 93.5 percent level in enriching uranium. The Pakistani rulers' nuclear ambitions are causing the utmost concern to the peoples of the region. If they are not stopped in time, stress many political and public functionaries, then they may create a very serious threat to the cause of peace and international security.

Meantime, the Pakistani rulers are trying to hide the military nature of their nuclear program. They have frequently declared that Pakistan needs nuclear power in order to build nuclear power stations to supply energy to the country. But these statements are very far from the actual situation. An American physicist, Professor (?Heizat), noted in this respect that Pakistani leaders have long understood that a peaceful atomic program can bring the country nearer to the creation of its nuclear potential, and to hide its true aim, which is the implementation of its military program.

At the same time, observers note that it is only thanks to the connivance and favorable information of Pakistan's Western allies that it has been able to create its industrial potential for producing nuclear arms. The American paper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR admits that if it were not for the comprehensive military-economic aid given by Washington, Pakistan would never have succeeded alone to approach the creation of nuclear arms. Back in 1954, the United States sold Pakistan its first nuclear reactor, thus giving the green light to supplies of nuclear equipment and technology to Pakistan from other Western countries as well. In 1978 and 1979, France sold Pakistan about 400 tons of uranium concentrates. Many secrets for manufacturing nuclear weapons were learned by Abdul Qader Khan when he was working in Holland. Now he has become one of the heads in Pakistan's work of creating its own atom bomb. Pakistani plants to produce enriched uranium have marks on various equipment saying: made in USA, made in West Germany, in Britain, made in France, in Belgium. It is also known that Pakistan refused to sign the treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear arms and, in the light of the new facts that have become known, it is perfectly clear that Islamabad's possession of nuclear arms may well lead to most pernicious consequences for the whole region.

PAKISTAN USES CLASHES TO QUELL OPPOSITION

LD170433 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 16 Dec 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Sergey Pravdin with Boris Andrianov]

[Text] [Pravdin] Bloody clashes continue for the 3d day now in Karachi between the mutually hostile communities: the Pashtuns and Mohajirs. They are taking place despite a curfew which the authorities introduced last Sunday in almost half of the city districts where army units and subdivisions of sailors have been deployed. According to information from REUTER, during intercommunal clashes over 140 people have died, while the number of injured taken to hospitals is coming close to 600. Life in Karachi is practically at a standstill. My colleague Boris Andrianov will tell you in more detail of events in Pakistan.

[Andrianov] The president of Pakistan, Ziaul Haq, and the prime minister, Junejo, arrived last night in Karachi. The latter has, as REUTER reports, accused subversive elements of provoking the bloody rioting in the major Pakistani city. This is why he says he has had to give the troops the order to shoot without warning in order to put an end to the outbreak of ethnic internecine dispute.

This is not the first time that the leaders of the Islamabad regime have resorted to such explanations. References to ethnic discord are for them just a convenient pretext for taking reprisals against the antigovernmental movement which is gaining breadth and strength in Pakistan. It has embraced practically all the country's provinces; demonstrations, meetings, and strikes spearheaded against the antipopular regime are constantly happening there. Everywhere police and troops put down these public manifestations, using any means right up to firearms.

Last month for example, the Pakistani authorities, in order to restore so-called order in the Province of Baluchistan, bombed certain areas.

The reason for the mass disturbances is not ethnic at all, said the leader of the opposition Pakistan People's Party, Benazir Bhutto. It is a matter of the antipopular policy of the regime's rulers who are directly responsible for the difficult economic situation in the country, for intensifying domestic political tension, and for the murder of innocent people. Therefore the opposition is demanding that Ziaul Haq should resign immediately and that there should be free general national elections in Pakistan in the next 4 months. However, this development in events does not suit Washington.

Yet another confirmation of this was cited by Abdul Wali Khan, chairperson of the Awami National Party, speaking in the city of Lahore. He pointed out that there are secret documents of the U.S. National Security Council that contain a Pentagon plan to use the military bases on Pakistani territory for aggression for independent states in South Asia.

It becomes clear from these documents that the U.S. Administration considers the coming to power in Pakistan of a government elected by the people undesirable; Washington is seriously concerned that such a government would refuse to follow the course of the U.S. adventurist strategy in Asia. It is for just this reason that the transoceanic politicians are supporting the current Islamabad regime in every way, implementing a large-scale militarization of Pakistan. Suffice it to say that in the Province of Baluchistan alone, which borders on Afghanistan and Iran, 32 military airfields are now being built or reconstructed with U.S. assistance. All these military sites, like the others in other areas of Pakistan, are in the opinion of informed sources in Washington and Islamabad directly linked to the Pentagon's plans to escalate even further the U.S. presence in South Asia.

In this way Pakistan has turned into a direct accessory of the dangerous policy of the U.S. imperialists, a policy aimed at undermining the security and sovereignty of states located in that region. Broad strata of the Pakistani people are declaring for all to hear that such actions by Islamabad contradict their will and aspirations. They demand an end to the militarization of the country which has become a bridgehead for the U.S. policy of neoglobalism and a base in the undeclared war against Afghanistan. Ziaul Haq's regime answers these demands with only the policeman's baton, teargas, and lead bullets, as has been shown graphically in the recent events in Karachi.

FURTHER ON LIGACHEV VISIT TO VIETNAMESE CONGRESS

Addresses Friendship Group

PM181120 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Meetings on Vietnamese Soil"]

[Text] Hanoi, 17 Dec -- The CPSU delegation headed by Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with activists of the Vietnamese-Soviet Friendship Society -- one of the biggest mass public organizations in the SRV.

Welcoming the Soviet guests, Nguyen Vinh, chairman of the society's central board, stressed that the members of the Vietnamese-Soviet Friendship Society unanimously support the foreign policy course of the CPSU and the Soviet state, aimed at ensuring peace and eliminating the threat of nuclear catastrophe. We regard it as the society's central task, he said, to propagandize this course and publicize in every way the achievements of the fraternal Soviet people and the inspiring decisions of the 27th congress of Lenin's party.

Ye.K. Ligachev spoke at the meeting. He cordially greeted the society's activists on behalf of the CPSU delegation.

The CPV [Communist Party of Vietnam] course elaborated at the congress in the light of specific Vietnamese conditions is consonant with the spirit of the decisions of the congresses held this year by the fraternal parties of other socialist countries, Ye.K. Ligachev said. It constitutes a realistic program of action for the SRV working people for the coming period and opens an important stage in your struggle for socialism.

We know how difficult the last 10 years were for your country. But we can also see that the Communist Party, having once again convincingly confirmed its role as the tried and tested vanguard of the Vietnamese people, has been able to analyze in depth and assess correctly the existing situation and outline concrete, effective measures to overcome the existing difficulties. The bold, resolute party demand to "approach the truth honestly, look the truth in the face, and speak the truth honestly" has done much to promote this. The fruitful criticism and self-criticism, high degree of exactingness toward all aspects of activity, and implacability toward shortcomings which marked both the precongress campaign and the work of the congress itself certainly strengthened the party's leading role, consolidated its ties with the people, and gave it new strength. The cause of socialism in Vietnam is in safe hands. There is no doubt that the tasks outlined by the congress will be fulfilled by the industrious Vietnamese people, who have more than once emerged with honor from severe trials.

We feel profound satisfaction about the fact that Soviet-Vietnamese relations today are a graphic example of socialist internationalism in action. The main force cementing these relations is the fraternal alliance of the CPSU and the CPV. Soviet-Vietnamese solidarity is based on the ideas of Great October and was first manifested in the assistance which was given to the Vietnamese freedom-fighters by Soviet Communists and the young Soviet Republic. The great Lenin and the outstanding revolutionary and internationalist Ho Chi Minh were present at the birth of our class fraternity.

The friendship and solidarity of our peoples were strengthened by the blood of their best sons, shed in the years of World War II, when they fought shoulder to shoulder against Hitlerite fascism. The names of a number of Vietnamese citizens who fought heroically against the German aggressors in Soviet Army units became known recently. Four of them died in the battle of Moscow -- Vuong Thuc Tinh, Ly Thuc Tat, Ly Nam Thanh, and Ly An Tao. They were posthumously awarded Orders of the Patriotic War, First class. We also pay due tribute to the courage of Soviet people, who, sparing no effort and not grudging life itself, devoutly fulfilled their international duty in Vietnam in the years of the rebuffing of American aggression.

After the victory over the aggressors, when major, difficult tasks of restoring the war-ravaged national economy faced the SRV, the Soviet Union once again came to the aid of its Vietnamese friends.

There is every reason to say that our ties have really deep, strong roots. The Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation between the USSR and the SRV rests on these roots, and its conclusion in 1978 was the logical and natural result of the entire course of development of our two countries' relations. This treaty enshrines the political will of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Vietnam to march in indissoluble cohesion along the path of building socialism and communism and live by the laws of combat and labor fraternity, in full accordance with the principles of socialist internationalism. It confirms that the two sides regard it as their international duty to give each other assistance in strengthening and defending the socialist gains achieved at the cost of heroic efforts and selfless labor by the Soviet and Vietnamese peoples.

The ideas of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Vietnam permeate all spheres of our countries' life. Concern for preserving and augmenting this priceless asset has become the cause of the broad people's masses, as is manifested in the activity of the USSR and SRV friendship societies, which number millions of activists in their ranks.

Ye.K. Ligachev went on to stress that in accordance with the demands of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 6th CPV Congress the friendship societies of our two countries must raise the level of their work still higher, in order to continue to be effective helpers to the CPSU and the CPV in the cause of educating the working people of the USSR and the SRV in the spirit of fraternity and indissoluble unity.

The spectrum of Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation, the head of the CPSU delegation went on, is extremely broad now, and all its aspects and facets are important and necessary. But particular significance is now attached to ties in the eocnomic sphere, since it is here that the material basis for our countries' successful development is created and strengthened. The main directions of bilateral economic cooperation for the current 5-year-plan period are well known. Our two countries' economic cooperation is to double in 5 years. In this connection we note with satisfaction that the task of utilizing Soviet aid more effectively was set at the Sixth CPV Congress. It is a question of assimilating equipment and machinery at your country's plants and construction sites. There is food for thought here. Let us organize our work together. This can only benefit the common cause.

In recent years the training of skilled workers for the SRV at plants and factories in the Soviet Union has expanded. some 4,000 Vietnamese citizens have already completed training and returned home. We also not with deep satisfaction that cultural rapprochement is steadily taking place between our peoples. This is promoted by the exchange of movies, exhibitions, and creative collectives and the publishing of books by Soviet and Vietnamese authors. From 1946 through 1985, 338 titles by Vietnamese authors were published in the Soviet Union, with a total print run of 16.5 million copies.

Soviet-Vietnamese friendship and cooperation are an important factor in international life, whose significance is consistently increasing. And the situation in the world today is extremely alarming. International tension has reached the danger point, through the fault of the aggressive forces of imperialism, above all American imperialism. This is due to a whole series of illegal actions by the White House, which, after departing from Reykjavik, is trying to wreck the treaty basis for strategic nuclear arms limitation and achieve military superiority. Our position in connection with the flagrant new challenge from Washington is set forth quite clearly in the recent Soviet Government statement. We thank you, friends, for your solidarity with the foreign policy line of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

In our day V.I. Lenin's warning t at successes and achievements in building the new society will reinforce imperialism's resistance retains its full relevance.

The Soviet Union, like the other fraternal countries, fully supports the peace-loving foreign policy course of the SRV, which together with Laos and Cambodia has put forward reasonable, constructive proposals aimed at turning Southeast Asia into a zone of peace and stability, as well as regulating relations with China. The implementation of these proposals would undoubtedly help improve the political climate in Asia.

It is well known that for every people, universal peace begins at their country's borders. That is why our countries attach particular significance to ensuring security in Asia, improving the political climate on the Asian continent, and seeking ways of establishing peace and stability here.

History has left Asia with many complex problems. Many countries here have been the target of colonial plundering and imperialist wars. The imperialists would like to continue to keep the Asian peoples subordinate to them and control their destiny to suit themselves. Pursuing their own political, economic, and military advantage, they will not reckon with the national interests of the region's countries, but seek to impose their own diktat.

A serious threat to the Asian countries' security emanates from the United States, which constantly builds up its military might in the region, encourages the militarization of other countries, and seeks opportunities to set Asian countries against each other. All this leads to destabilization of the situation on the continent and a dangerous growth in tension, and is the main cause of regional problems and conflicts.

There is much talk in the world today about the situation in the Asia-Pacific region. That is only natural, because the region has strategic significance. Our viewpoint on this matter is known; it was stated at the 27th CPSU Congress, and the USSR's detailed position on the Asia-Pacific region was set forth in Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's speech in Vladivostok.

The visit by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to India and the documents signed there are of extremely great significance for strengthening the cause of peace throughout the world. The Delhi declaration on the principles for a nonviolent world free from nuclear weapons, adopted as a result of the visit, is a major contribution to the positive world process aimed at securing the interests of international security and cooperation. It serves the great goal of establishing the concept of péace as the highest value for all mankind.

The head of the CPSU delegation spoke of the course of restructuring in the USSR and the fulfillment of the 27th party congress decisions. In conclusion he said: We have all entered the year of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. [paragraph continues]

For revolutionary fighters, the builders of the new society, and all forces of peace and progress this jubilee will undoubtedly be a mighty stimulus to further boost the struggle for the triumph of the ideals of Great October.

The world socialist system is a decisive force in this struggle. The development of the fraternal socialist countries and their foreign policy aimed at general and complete disarmament are the main avenue in mankind's progress. Life has shown convincingly that the socialist community is the reliable bulwark of the cause of peace, freedom, and independence of the peoples in the struggle against the forces of imperialism and reaction. The success of the struggle for this great cause will be promoted by the further strengthening of the fraternal socialist states' unity, their all-around cooperation in building the new society, and the stepping up of their joint contribution to strengthening peace and the peoples' security.

Ye.K. Ligachev presented the high Soviet awards conferred on the Vietnamese heroes who took part in the battle of Moscow. He presented the friendship society with a souvenir gift from the CPSU delegation.

Visits Ho Chi Minh Mausoleum

LD160941 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0740 GMT 16 Dec 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; special correspondent's report from Hanoi]

[Text] Early this morning, before the start of the 2d day of the work of the sixth congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam, the Soviet party delegation, headed by Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, visited the Ho Chi Minh mausoleum, on Ba Dinh Square in Hanoi. Ligachev laid a wreath at the tomb.

Comrade Ligachev and the members of the delgation also visited the monument to Vladimir Illich Lenin, erected not far from the mausoleum, and laid a basket of flowers by its plinth.

[Video shows shot of mausoleum, then two Vietnamese soldiers carrying a wreath and goosestepping. Ligachev is seen following the soldiers, flanked by Medvedev and a Vietnamese official. There is a closeup of the wreath, and the message on the red ribbon says "From the CPSU Delegation at the Sixth CPV Congress." Then there is a closeup of Ligachev and Medvedev, and a shot of the statue of Lenin, with a basket of flowers at the plinth.]

Views Hydroelectic Complex

LD171139 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 17 Dec 86

[Text] Today, the CPSU delegation to the sixth congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam, headed by Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee visited the town of Hoa Binh. The delegation viewed a hydroelectric complex being built by Vietnamese and Soviet construction workers. The guests spoke to the construction chiefs, workers, and engineers. A meeting of Vietnam-Soviet frienship was also held at the construction site.

Meets Laos' Kaysone Phomvihan

LD171913 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Dec 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The CPSU delegation headed by Comrade Ligachev today met with the delegation of the People's Revolutionary Party of Laos at the Sixth congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam, headed by Kaysone Phomvihan. Noting the successful development of Soviet-Lao relations, the sides spoke out in favor of the further deepening of friendship and cooperation between the two parties, and between the Soviet Union and the Lao People's Democratic Republic in the interests of the peoples of the two countries, and lasting peace in Asia and throughout the world. [video shows Ligachev, Kaysone Phomvihan seated in discussion]

Medvedev Addresses Workers

LD180031 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Dec 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Medvedev addressed the participants of a power workers meeting on behalf of our delegation. He said in part:

[Begin Medvedev recording] Dear comrade hydrobuilders, friends: On behalf of the CPSU delegation participating in the work of the Sixth Communist Party of Vietnam Congress, I express to you a heartfelt gratitude for a warm welcome, and give my best wishes to your harmonious and international collective. [applause]

Comrades, our countries are not on the same level of socioeconomic development, but we have a lot in common in terms of realistic, critical approaches to matters: in the striving for a new way of thinking and acting; in finding ways and reserves for quick progress; making the socialist potential grow; securing the strengthening of its prestige and influence on the international arena; strengthening solidarity and unity of all democratic and progressive forces; struggling decisively for the preservation and consolidation of universal peace and the security of the peoples; and for curbing the forces of aggression and war. Today this is the most important, the most necessary concern, for in the nuclear epoch we are talking about the survival itself of the whole human race.

The Soviet program for creating a universal system of international security, the concrete proposals put forward in the speeches of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, including his speech in Vladivostok and during his recent visit to India, have an invaluable significance for the whole world community. Putting these ideas into operation would not only allow the human race to enter the 21st century without mass extermination weapons, but would also open up tremendous possibilities for a most rapid liquidation of poverty and cultural and economic backwardness of hundreds of millions of people in the developing countries.

Now that I am in Vietnam, which endured long and harsh years of war caused by imperialist policies, I clearly sense the craving of your people for peace. Having defended your freedom and independence, having made your sacred dream of bringing about the unity of your fatherland come true, the Vietnamese people, under the direction of their party, are creating a new life for themselves today.

Soviet people understand well what a difficult task the building of socialism is. There are many problems. But whoever at any time or place said that the building of a new society was a simple task? All of us, members of the CPSU delegation, experience feelings of deep satisfaction and support at the realistic approach of your party congress toward the assesment of the socioeconomic situation in the country, toward those problems that will need to be resolved in the forthcoming years.

The congress will undoubtedly become a major landmark, opening up a new stage in the sociopolitical and economic development of the country. Vietnamese Communists, the whole Vietnamese people, with their characteristic energy and purposefulness, by strengthening and developing their present achievements, will overcome difficulties and will honorably fulfill the tasks set forward by the Sixth Communist Party of Vietnam Congress. We sincerely wish you success, dear friends. [end recording]

3 SRV LEADERS TO STEP DOWN; HEALTH CITED

LD170728 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0710 GMT 17 Dec 86

[Text] Hanoi, 17 Dec (TASS) -- Today at the morning session of the sixth congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV], which is continuing here, Pham Hung, member of the Politburo of the CPV Central Committee, informed the delegates that Comrades Truong Chinh, Pham Van Dong, and Le Duc Tho had addressed a request to the Presidium of the congress not to be candidates at the election of a new CPV Central Committee because of their states of health. The congress Presidium approved the request from Comrades Truong Chinh, Pham Van Dong, and Le Duc Tho, and noted their huge services to the party and state as worthy pupils and continuers of the cause of Ho Chi Minh. The congress requested Comrades Truong Chinh, Pham Van Dong, and Le Duc Tho to remain as advisers to the CPV Central Committee.

New CPV General Secretary

LD180851 Moscow TASS in English 0845 GMT 18 Dec 86

[Text] Hanoi December 18 TASS -- Nguyen Van Linh, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV), has been unanimously elected the general secretary of the CPV Central Committee at the first plenary meeting of the newly-elected Central Committee of the CPV.

NICARAGUAN ASSEMBLY GRANTS HASENFUS PARDON

LD180652 Moscow TASS in English 0445 GMT 18 Dec 86

[Text] Managua December 18 (TASS) -- On Wednesday the National Assembly of Nicaragua granted a request made by the republic's President Daniel Ortega to pardon U.S. military adviser Eugene Hasenfus who had been sentenced to thirty years imprisonment for the crime against the Sandinist revolution. Hasenfus had participated in the supply of arms and military equipment to the contras.

He was released from custody and turned over to U.S. Democratic Senator Christopher Dodd who was in Managua. On December 17 the former prisoner together with the senator left by air for the United States.

The decision to pardon Hasenfus, a statement issued by the National Assembly of Nicaragua emphasises, is illustrative of the strength of the Sandinista people's revolution and of the steady resolve of the Nicaraguan people to fight for peace.

NICARAGUA'S ORTEGA ON U.S. INTERVENTION, INTENT

LD180701 Moscow TASS in English 0650 GMT 18 Dec 86

[Text] Managua December 18 TASS -- The dramatic aggravation of the military and political situation in Central America testifies to the intention of the U.S. Administration to make in the near future an open attempt to intervene militarily in Nicaragua, President Daniel Ortega said at a press conference here.

The United States, he noted, is using the Honduran regime to fan explosive tension in the region. Provocative American-Honduran military exercises are being carried out in the immediate proximity of Nicaragua's state border, posing a grave threat to the independence and national sovereignty of the republic. Washington is clearly seeking a pretext for outright aggression against the Nicaraguan people under the false pretext of protecting its allies in Central America.

The Nicaraguan president said that a recent meeting of the Sandinist Assembly, the supreme consultative body of the Sandinist National Liberation Front, had noted the need to strengthen the country's defenses to protect the revolution against the aggressors' encroachments. To this end the government took the decision to carry out military exercises of a purely defensive character in western departments. The threats of the U.S. Administration to "retaliate" against Nicaragua are another attempt to prepare the ground for the escalation of aggression against the Sandinist people's revolution, the Nicaraguan leader stressed.

The United States, Daniel Ortega said furthermore, is capable of launching aerial bombardment of Nicaragua. Small wonder that the American spy Sam Hall, arrested by the Nicaraguan security forces, had carried plans of the republic's economic and military installations. All of them have long been marked on the Pentagon's maps as targets for air strikes or attacks with other weapons. Hall attempted to supplement secret intelligence which the United States obtains with spy planes.

An investigation also showed that the mercenary spy who had worked for the Reagan administration had earlier contributed to the training of contras for terrorist operations against Nicaragua, the president stressed. Daniel Ortega said that Sam Hall would be tried by the anti-Somozist people's tribunal, just like the American military adviser Hasenfus, who had been sentenced to 30 years in prison for his crimes against the Nicaraguan people.

RSFSR COUNCIL OF MINISTERS PRESIDIUM MEETS

PM171355 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Dec 86 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the RSFSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] At its latest session, the RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium examined the question of progress in the fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On Measures To Accelerate Economic and Social Development in Tuva ASSR" and the relevant RSFSR Council of Ministers resolution. It was noted that specific measures have been planned and are being implemented in the autonomous republic for the development of all sectors of the national economy, and that their implementation is being monitored. Growth has been achieved in output volumes, sales of industrial and agricultural output, and commissioning of fixed capital and projects for production, social, and cultural purposes.

But the work on fulfilling the resolutions, the presidium session recognized, is being done in an unsatisfactory fashion, without sufficient purposefulness and consistency. The Tuva ASSR Government is slow in restructuring its work in the light of the 27th CPSU Congress demands, and its approach toward the solution of the most important national economic questions remains unchanged. The autonomous republic's Council of Ministers does not make full use of the rights and powers vested in it to ensure the territory's comprehensive economic and social development, exercises insufficient coordination and monitoring of the activity of enterprises and organizations to enhance the efficiency of social production, and fails to show the due demandingness toward local ispolkoms as regards their organizational work and monitoring of progress in the fulfillment of party and government resolutions. As a result of this, some leaders of soviet and economic organs have taken a parasitical stance regarding the implementation of set targets.

The session criticized a number of ministries and departments at union and republican level for tolerating lack of discipline, arbitrarily extending the deadlines for project construction, failing to ensure the prompt elaboration of plan estimate documentation, and inadequately collaborating with contractual construction organizations. Inadequate sponsorship assistance is provided by Krasnoyarsk Krayispolkom and Irkutsk, Tomsk, Novosibirsk, Kemerovo, and Tula Oblispolkoms.

The RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium analyzed the progress in fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on improving the utilization of timber raw material resources and in fulfilling the republican Council of Ministers resolution on this matter. A certain amount of work is being done in the RSFSR on the fulfillment of party and government resolutions, but many shortcomings still exist in the utilization of timber raw material resources. Over the last few years, timber procurement enterprises have undersupplied the national economy by tens of millions of cubic meters of commercial lumber, and there has been inadequate development of production capacities for cardboard, wood board, and wood chips, which hampers the utilization of deciduous softwood and low-grade deal. The use of timber waste in industrial processing is extremely poor.

The RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium ordered the ministries and departments dealing with timber procurements and wood processing to take effective measures to eliminate shortcomings and fundamentally improve the utilization of timber raw material resources and of the lumber being procured.

A targeted comprehensive program for the construction of self-contained rural dwellings [monolitnyy usadebnyy zhiloy dom] by the RSFSR State Agro-Industrial Committee in 1986-90 was also examined and approved.

GUSEV, AFONIN ATTEND TU CONGRESS IN MOSCOW

PM171617 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 13 Dec 86 p 2

[TASS report: "Trade Union Congress"]

[Text] Foremost workers, innovators of chemical and petrochemical production processes, and scientists have assembled in the Hall of Columns of the House of the Unions in Moscow. The Third Chemical and Petrochemical Industry Workers Trade Union Congress opened there yesterday. Its participants will hear reports by the trade union Central Committee and Auditing Commission, discuss the tasks of trade union activists under the conditions of the restructuring which has embraced labor collectives and elect the leading organs and the delegates to the 18th USSR Trade Union Congress. V.K. Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and V.G. Afonin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Chemical Industry Section, are participating in the work of the congress.

OFFICIALS SIGN OBITUARY OF CHERNIGOV OBKOM CHIEF

PM171641 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 86 First Edition p 6

[Obituary: "Nikolay Vasilevich Umanets"]

[Excerpts] Nikolay Vasilevich Umanets, former first secretary of the Chernigov Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom and personal pensioner of all-union status died 1 December 1986 in his 62d year after a long and serious illness. [passage omitted]

Ye. K. Ligachev, V. V. Shcherbitskiy, V.P. Nikonov, G.P. Razumovskiy, I.V. Kapitonov, N.Ye. Kruchina, I.A. Gerasimov, Yu. N. Yelchenko, Ye. V. Kachalovskiy, B.V. Kachura, A.P. Lyashko, V.P. Mironov, I.A. Mozgovoy, V.A. Sologub, A.A. Titarenko, V.S. Shevchenko, V.F. Dobrik, V.A. Ivashko, Yu. A. Kolomiyets, V.D. Kryuchkov, V.A. Masol, S.N. Mukha, Ya. P. Pogrebnyak, V.M. Kavun, L.I. Plazhchenko.

YEVTUSHENKO DEFENDS AITMATOV, NEW NOVEL

LD101414 Moscow TASS in English 1320 GMT 10 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 10 TASS -- A heated debate has been on in the Soviet press on Chinghiz Aitmatov's latest novel "The Chopping Block" and some literary critics and public-affairs writers have scolded the author for what they said was "looking for truth to God" and " sticking up for religion."

Writing in the youth newspaper KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA today, well-known Soviet poet Yevgeniy Yevtushenko took issue with their judgements of Aitmatov's book.

He said it was utterly wrong to identify the author with the hero of his novel, a former student of a theological seminary.

But the main mistake of the book's critics, Yevtushenko said, was their primitive interpretation of the freedom of religion.

"The church here is detached from the state. And this is fair. But nowhere in our law is there written that atheism is inseparable from the state," he said.

Like some other literary critics commenting on "The Chopping Block" before him, Yevtushenko asserted that reflecting on the moral nature of religion was an author's inalienable right and that there were no "off-limits" topics for writers.

Materialism, those advocating this view maintain, has evolved out of an analysis of religion, not a comic-book analysis that is but an analysis based on the knowledge of the sources. Genuflection before religion, they say, is alien to Marxism, but genuflection before itself is equally so.

The Soviet poet said it shouldn't be forgotten that along with the clergymen, who had blessed the killing of Vietnamese civilians, or those, who were today preaching the ideas of enmity and distrust between nations, there were also quite a few religious workers of a different kind, those serving peace and doing well in good faith.

On the other hand, he added, there were criminals also among atheists.

"Atheism per se is not a source of morality. The source of morality is a culture distinguished by a revolutionary attitude to reality. And this culture by no means dumps the values of the past but makes them an asset of the future."

Views Religion, Morality

PM111240 Moscow KOMOSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 86 p 2

["Letter to the Editorial Office" by Yevgeniy Yevtushenko as part of "Dialogue" feature: "Culture Is the Source of Morality"]

[Text] Recently it has become too easy to be regarded as an intellectual. You only have to have a university badge in your lapel to be indisputably a cultured person. If you count up the number of people with higher education, you find that our country is literally inundated with intelligentsia. But is that really so? How many people who graduate from VUZE have gone there by no means because of their love for a particular profession, but because "their parents decided," and how many are not rejected solely because of parental or other pressure and leniency in entrance and graduation examinations...The real problem is that the country is inundated with unprofessional people.

An unprofessional doctor, however mild he may be as an individual, is a potential murderer. But in a certain sense any unprofessional is a murderer. An unprofessional writer is a murderer of innocent paper, an unprofessional economist is a murderer of the people's money, an unprofessional construction worker is a murderer of construction materials, an unprofessional reshaper of nature is a murderer of rivers and lakes, and an unprofessional lecturer is a murderer of my time and yours.

However, the acquisition of narrow professional skills is not good culture, either. You can be quite a good doctor or quite a good engineer, but if your range of interests goes no higher than professional interests, you are nothing more than a technician, not an intellectual. You cannot be an outstanding doctor of genius or an outstanding engineer of genius while retaining a generally restricted approach. Only people of a high level of multifaceted cultural development can bring about real, revolutionary changes in their own work and in history in general.

Lamentable evidence of the inadequate level of cultural development is provided by the success of cheap commercial movies, second-rate songs, sentimental pseudopoetry, and cleverly concocted easy-to-read novels. True culture is taste which prevents you from swallowing dubious bait. This kind of taste cannot be inculcated artificially. True culture is a knowledge of the experience accumulated over the whole of mankind's existence. This experience is made up of history, folk wisdom, philosophy (including a knowledge of religion), science, and art. Let us be honest with each other -- would many of our qualified graduates pass examinations in these five subjects?

At the show "Dictatorship of Conscience" in the Lenin Komsomol Theater, which you would expect to be packed with the intellectual public, when an actor asked the auditorium: "Who was Andre Marti?", the audience usually responded with silence. Yet Andre Marti was written about by Hemingway, who is supposed to be one of the most widely read foreign writers in our country. What a striking discrepancy: hundreds of thousands of pictures of Hemingway in apartments today, and ignorance of his work. Try starting to quote Pushkin's "The less we love a woman...", and 90 percent of our modern intellectuals, glad of the opportunity to confirm their acquaintance with culture, will eagerly continue "... the more we please her." Yet Pushkin writes"... the more easily we can please her." The huge waiting lines for exhibitions by certain far from unquestionable artists whom the naive crowd regard as all but pioneers testify to a lack of knowledge of the primary sources -- beginning with Nesterov and Rerikh. Ignorance of the primary sources leads to highly dubious sources.

The habit of allowing your cross to hang outside your shirt or blouse, which has become the fashion, indicates an elementary failure to understand what the crucifixion is, rather than religious fanaticism. Which is more dangerous -- ignorance of religion or religious fanaticism? Perhaps these two phenomena are profoundly interconnected, but we will not try to get to the bottom of that. When on Easter night, in order to distract young people from watching the religious procession -- and there is no denying that it is more beautiful and poetical than any public meeting! -- our inventive television puts out nighttime entertainment shows, I see that only as weakness on our part. For all the numerous attempts to organize something in the palaces of weddings which is beautiful enough to outshine the religious wedding ceremony, nothing sensible has come of it yet. People sometimes get married or baptize their children in church not because of "religious fanaticism," but because it is beautiful. The churches attract many people to enter them, and not only believers, because the architecture is enchanting and the faces of the saints, painted by geniuses from among the people, are more impressive than the stony faces on boards of honor. It is really not possible to build new, modern buildings in such a way that the heart is enraptured by today's enchantment, it is really not possible to depict our contemporaries with the inspiration of a Rublev -- with the brush, or even with the camera which we so underestimate?

The source of morality is culture. But we cannot discard religion from the historical experience -- positive and negative -- or morality, since the history of religion cannot be separated from history as such. Throughts about religion, if they are not of the nature of straightforward debunking, cannot be interpreted mockingly as "flirting with the divine." Lenin's phrase is devastatingly accurate, but it was said at a specific time and aimed at specific people, and it is not appropriate to transfer it to today and aim it at our leading writers. That, unfortunately, is precisely what Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Kryvelev did in the article "Toying With the Divine." In violation of professional ethics, Kryvelev did not wait for the final publication of Aytmatov's new novel "The Scaffold," but accused the author in advance of "leaving morality at the mercy of religion." At the same time he accuses Bykov and Astafyev of the same thing. Kryvelev falls into the elementary error of identifying Aytmatov's hero with the author. Aha, so the hero is a seeker after God; that means the author is a seeker after God. [paragraph continues]

This kind of argument reeks strongly of mothball fumes of arguments which you would think had been discarded from our critical vocabulary forever. But no -- the box of the past is not yet firmly closed and locked, and the accusations which we all remember with sorrow are constantly jumping out of this junk-filled box like devils out of a snuffbox...

Why does Bykov not have the right, after noting many of religion's dark sides, to say objectively that "it also preached human values of importance to all times and peoples"? Is that not the truth? Remember, for instance, that at the time of the Roman Empire Christianity played a clearly progressive role: Not for nothing were the champions of the ideas "thou shalt not kill!" and "love thy neighbor as thyself!" torn to pieces by the imperial lions. Kryvelev is right to speak of the cruelty of the crusades or the fires of the inquisition, which distorted with bloody hypocrisy the postulates of Christianity. But was Christianity the only case of this in history? Remember the genocide in Cambodia, when Pol Pot's followers declared "Red terror" on their own people? And there is plenty more one could mention... The postulates should not be confused with distortions of them.

In our country the constitution speaks clearly and precisely of freedom of religion. In our country the church is separate from the state, and that is right. But nowhere in our laws does it say that atheism is inseparable from the state. Our socialist state is a union of Communists and nonparty people, believers and atheists. Atheism is a voluntary matter, and cannot be imposed by force. Atheism should be one manifestation of the freedoms of our society, as is religious belief, and not a manifestation of coercion. Lenin warned of this in the very first years of Soviet power, expressing concern about all cultural and historical monuments, including churches. Our state is now spending huge sums on restoring churches which "proletarian cultural [proletkultovskiy] barbarism" turned into vegetable stores and cowsheds. Although Kryvelev dissociates himself in his article from proletarian culture, he is prepared, after the manner of proletarian culture, rapidly to excommunicate from materialism those readers who think analytically about religion. But all materialism grew out of the analysis of religion, and not a caricatured analysis, but a profoundly thoughtful one based on a knowledge of the primary sources. Genuflecting to religion is alien to true Marxism, but genuflecting to itself is equally alien.

Kryvelev accuses Christian teachings of being "fixed, like something immutable and binding for all time." It looks as though the author is against dogmatism. But a few paragraphs later he defends atheism with the most tedious dogmatic rhetoric: "Our atheism is based on the foundation of a scientific philosophy, and is just as immutable as that philosophy." Engaging in polemics with dogmas of any kind is futile if it is carried out with the help of other dogmas. Let us note that the epithet "immutable" is employed accusingly in one case and in a purely laudatory sense in the other case. It is precisely to escape such tedious atheistic lectures that young people run to watch religious processions.

Kryvelev is right to find numerous contradictions in the Bible, though he is hardly breaking new ground here. That book was written and rewritten by many people at different times. But the Bible itself is by no means to blame for the fact that, as Kryvelev puts it, "for the modern Israeli soldier Biblical precepts serve as important material for the ideological justification of the extermination of Arabs." The Bible is a great cultural monument. I do not understand to this day why the state publishing house has published the Koran, but not the Bible. Without a knowledge of the Bible, our young people cannot understand a great deal of Pushkin, Gogol, Dostoyevskiy, and Tolstoy. The whole of early Mayakovskiy is strewn with Biblical metaphors. The Bible fetches huge sums of money in second-hand book stores and on the "black market." If Kryvelev wants everyone to become an atheist, how can they, without knowing the Bible? Everyone knows that forbidden fruit is sweet.

That should be the concern of a doctor of philosophical sciences, who, you would think, ought to know that there can be no thesis without antithesis. The socialist philosophy is not a self-contained philosophical system which sprang from nowhere. The socialist philosophy has absorbed all the moral quests of human thought in the name of man, including the best of Christian morality. For society to develop, it must know how to sum up and filter out, but nothing of value from the experience of thought must be discarded.

Religion at the service of social oppression has rightly been called the opium of the people. But can we forget that during the war against fascism our church collected huge sums for the common victory? Can we forget that Hewlett Johnson, dean of Canterbury Cathedral, was one of the founders of the peace movement? Can we forget that the priest Ernesto Cardenal became one of Latin America's outstanding revolutionary poets in the struggle against imperialism?

Yes, there are also the priests who blessed the planes which flew off to pour napalm on Vietnamese villages, the priests who are today apostles of the cold war. But the simplistic division of the world into believers and atheists, as if into the impure and the pure, does not stand up to any criticism on the basis of scientific materialism. Kryvelev falls into an outright proletarian culture mentality when he writes: "Not only is morality not contraindicated to it (atheism -- Ye.Ye.), it is organically inherent in it." So being an atheist gives you an indulgence against immorality? If only it were so! But unfortunately many so-called atheists are thieves who pick the people's pockets, bureaucrats, toadies, bribe-takers, pilferers, and political chameleons, and are in no way better than those priests who rob simplehearted believers.

Atheism is not in itself a source of morality. The source of morality is culture. The culture of human behavior. The culture of conscience, which has no need of scientific diplomas. The culture of the soul, even the uneducated soul, which nevertheless senses instinctively what is truth and what is lies. But if an instinctive love of truth is combined with education, such a source of morality cannot be confused by pseudotheories of any kind -- either religious fanaticism or proletarian cultural barbarism.

I do not suggest banging our heads against the church flagstones. The source of morality cannot smell only of icon incense or archive dust. The source of morality is above all life itself and people themselves, like a many-faced but single god consisting of those who fight for people's liberation from false idols. The source of morality is creativity, not slavery; labor, not idleness. The source of morality is the culture of a revolutionary attitude to reality. And that culture in no way erases the values of the past, but transforms them into the property of the future. A lack of faith in anything is worse than a false faith. But there are unfading values worthy of a faith based not on fanaticism, but on understanding of the nature of mankind's struggle for justice.

ACADEMIC TAKES ISSUE WITH YEVTUSHENKO ARTICLE

PM121215 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 86 p 2

["Scientist's Opinion" by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Suren Kaltakhchyan, honored scientist of the RSFSR, as part of "Dialogue" feature: "Not Faith, but Knowledge" -- capitalized passages within slantlines printed in capitals; capitalized passages within double slantlines printed in italics]

[Text] Ye. Yevtushenko's rejoinder article necessitates a serious discussion about ideological sloppiness, which is, unfortunately, not a rare phenomenon in our literature today.

The party has repeatedly drawn attention to this in the last few years at congresses and plenums and in special CPSU Central Committee resolutions. The Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th party congress noted in particular that "...attempts are being made in certain works of literature and art and in scientific works to present in idyllic hues reactionary-nationalist and religious survivals of the past which contradict our ideology, the socialist way of life, and the scientific world outlook."

We shall discuss the phenomenon as a whole. Our objective will be to identify and analyze the phenomenon, rather than to comment on the poet's remarks about philosophy and history, although they also help in perceiving the phenomenon better.

People sometimes attempt to justify turning to religion by saying that religion is part of culture, and culture is, they say, the source of morality. These claims are valid only under one essential condition: Provided that the terms "culture" and "morality" and religion's place within them are scientifically explained.

Life and the social system provide the basis on which a certain culture and its corresponding morality emerge. But in order to understand what kind of culture and morality, it is necessary to distinguish between culture in the narrow meaning and culture in the broad meaning of the word.

Lenin considered this to be of fundamental importance. He took the first to include /ONLY/ those creations of mankind's, which assist society's progressive development. But Lenin took the second to include absolutely everything created by people, and therefore considered that an antagonistic society "has two national cultures within each national culture": a progressive culture and a reactionary culture.

Strange attempts have been made recently to present Lenin's concept simply as a figurative expression or to limit its sphere of application: It is, so it is claimed, applicable only to political culture.

Lenin applied it to all culture, including art. One even comes across claims that, after the October Revolution, Lenin allegedly revised his concept of the "two cultures." This "discovery" is "substantiated" by attributing to Lenin an identification of the term "culture" with the term "valuable." And on this "basis" Lenin's struggle against "proletarian culture" [proletkult] is counterposed to his concept of the "two cultures." In actual fact, however, unless one resorts to truncated quotations and to a biased presentation of them, as some authors do, it is easy to see in V.I. Lenin the interconnection between the concept of "two cultures" and the struggle against "proletarian culture." Thus, while prior to the October Revolution Lenin wrote: "We take from /EVERY/ national culture /ONLY/ its democratic and its socialist elements," after October V.I. Lenin repeatedly and persistently emphasized the idea that, in order to create a socialist culture, it is necessary to take and develop //ONLY THE BEST EXAMPLES// from the culture of the past. In his speech "Tasks of the Youth Unions," warning against forgetting the class approach, V.I. Lenin said: "We must not take from the old schools the practice whereby a young person's mind was burdened by a vast quantity of knowledge, nine-tenths of it unnecessary and one-tenth distorted..." In his "Notes for a Resolution on Proletarian Culture," Lenin wrote: "Not the /INVENTION/ of a new proletarian culture, but the /DEVELOPMENT/ of the best examples, traditions, and results of /EXISTING/ culture /FROM THE VIEWPOINT/ of the Marxist world outlook..."

Lenin based his concept of the "two cultures" on the indisputable fact that "/EVERY/ nation also has a bourgeois culture (and most also have a Black Hundreds culture and a clerical culture)." Or after a socialist revolution must we also take over the bourgeois culture, in other words, the culture which serves the narrowly selfish interests of the bourgeoisie? Strange as it may seem, such views are still encountered among our literary figures today.

Some of them are seeking useful vitamins to reanimate the "single stream in culture" even among counterrevolutionary figures like K.N. Leontyev, V.V. Rozanov, N.A. Berdyayev, and VEKHI [liberal anthology published in 1909] in general, which was described by Lenin as a solid stream of reactionary slop poured over democracy. Perceiving VEKHI as an /"ENCYCLOPEDIA OF LIBERAL APOSTASY,"/ V.I. Lenin considered that a "complete, clear-cut, and open demarcation between democrats and renegades is the most useful and most necessary thing." Evidently, the champions of the "single stream" consider such a demarcation neither useful nor necessary.

People sometimes ask: As part of which culture should one classify, for example, the works of Count L.N. Tolstoy, or churches, icons, and so on. Do the champions of the "two cultures" concept not think of considering them part of democratic culture?

But why should anyone doubt that everything that is truly artistic and beautiful serves the aesthetic growth and cultural development of the people's masses? And when have Marxist-Leninists determined the democratic nature of culture by the class origins of its makers? Remember what a high opinion Engels had of Balzac for having created outstanding realistic works despite his class sympathies and political prejudices.

Let us also ponder the following: Why did V.I. Lenin consider that Tolstoy, thanks to his critical realism and enormous artistic talent, was the mirror of the Russian revolution, despite the fact that he personally belonged to the landowning class? Taking as criterion the class origins of a cultural figure instead of the objective importance of his works is not a Marxist but a vulgar sociological approach. V.I. Lenin's thesis concerning the split in culture in an antagonistic society, which was aimed against the "single stream" concept, simultaneously opposed vulgar sociology, which fails to perceive the succession of ages in the development of culture. This is why Lenin's struggle against "proletarian culture" does not contradict the "two cultures" concept but is its continuation and development.

The question "What to take over and what to discard?" remains valid even as regards the legacy of the same creator. It is necessary to separate the valuable from the harmful, as, for example, with L.N. Tolstoy himself it is necessary to separate Tolstoy the genius from Tolstoyanism.

As for attitudes toward historical monuments, history must not be forgotten here, either, still less be denigrated. Even the adversaries of the October Revolution were forced to admit that it preserved historical monuments more carefully than any bourgeois revolution. Admittedly, some valuable monuments were indeed lost in the revolutionary whirlwind for various reasons. This is to be regretted, but there are no grounds to attribute it to evil intentions. As the philosopher Spinoza said a long time ago, "Do not weep, do not laugh, but understand."

Now that nationwide attention to the preservation of monuments has increased, we must not go to the other extreme. Now, too, we must not forget the "two cultures," as some authors would have us do. Now, too, we do not need every single tiny stone. Remember that the first part of Lenin's decree on monuments spoke of the dismantling of monuments erected to honor tsars and their servants. [paragraph continues]

Of course, this concerned monuments which were of neither historical nor artistic interest. The second part of the decree concerned the creation of monuments "to commemorate the great revolution which has transformed Russia." Lenin had a very differentiated approach toward monuments of antiquity.

P.D. Malkov, first Soviet commandant of the Kremlin, recalled: "Coming out of the doorway to the Council of People's Commissars, we passed the Tsar's Belfry and drew level with the Cathedral of the Annunciation; at that point I asked Vladimir Ilich whether the icons ought to be taken away.

"'Correct,' Ilich replied, 'quite correct. They certainly should be. Not all of them, though: The ancient ones, those of artistic or historical value, must be left and the others taken away.'"

Lenin was perfectly aware that, for instance, the unique icons painted by Rublev, which are perceived by a materialistically educated person not as a religious object but as an object of philosophical and artistic perception, are one thing. And the icons produced by icon-daubers and reproduced by copyists in their thousands are something quite different. This is why references to great works by artists like A. Rublev, A. Ivanov, J. Bach, A. Duerer, and others who responded to biblical subjects and were closely involved in religious life cannot serve as proof of the merging of artistic and religious cultures.

Their works actually offer perfect proof that the prevalence of the aesthetic element in them destroyed religious structures.

The trend toward demarcating between artistic creativity and religious imagery developed over the centuries. Nowadays the brilliant portrayals in religious places, which have, incidentally, their roots in the earth, still remain as monuments of culture. A.V. Lunacharskiy's remark on this is noteworthy: "These gods are dead, therefore they are beautiful." In the atheists' view, only the human element still lives in the great works on religious subjects (including churches and monasteries). They may be familiar with religious subjects, but their symbolism remains "silent" for atheists. Believers can also, of course, directly observe and perceive beauty, but for them it is overshadowed by religious perception and fanaticism.

Any attempts to reduce religion to mythology and, on this "basis," to present religion as a component of genuine culture, are also inconsistent.

Primitive people used mythical concepts to reproduce their ties with the natural environment.

Such thinking is prescientific, but it is nevertheless rational. Mythology in the early class society expressed not only religious but also moral, philosophical, aesthetic, and sociopolitical ideas. Religion, which emerged later than mythology and art, was from the very beginning an irrational part of culture.

Religion developed as a parasite on art, like barren flowers on the living tree of knowledge, and in the class society it took shape as a reactionary world outlook. Religion did not enrich culture, but took from culture everything that it could exploit for its own consolidation. From the very beginning it exploited the artistic and figurative method used by primitive man to interpret the world. The same myth could serve as the basis of art, of an aesthetically developed consciousness, and of perverted religious conceptions. It is notorious that to this day the church exploits artistic rituals.

All that has been said so far shows quite clearly that the morality and art that have been tightly attached to religion for centuries ("religious morality," "religious art") have, in fact, nothing in common with the essence of religion. Their essence and content are determined by the specific historical forms of socioeconomic life and class struggle.

To be ignorant of these truths or to counterpose to them the bogey of "dogmatism," vulgar sociology, and proletarian culture seems, to use Ye. Yevtushenko's words, unprofessional.

And one more fundamental remark. While some authors, abundantly and "originally" quoting Lenin, try groundlessly to enlist him as an ally, others, pretending to wage a struggle against "dogmatism," either keep silent about highly conclusive (but inconvenient in the current instance) propositions by V.I. Lenin or, having paid lipservice to some proposition of Lenin's, hasten immediately to file it away in the archives. This, they say, applies to the past.

It is even worse when some theoreticians uproot themselves from scientific soil or, even more accurately, from our ideology. They ascribe a superficial (not to say flippant) attitude toward the theoretical legacy of K. Marx, F. Engels, and V.I. Lenin to a desire to explain new phenomena of social life. No attention is paid to the fact that, by no means coincidentally, the "de-Leninization" of our ideology is the main dream of the entire anticommunist camp.

V.I. Lenin warned that a superficial approach to the theoretical legacy of Marx and Engels makes it "easy to cover oneself with shame" and that "we must learn from them. We must not abandon this ground." These words must be fully applied to V.I. Lenin himself, for without his teaching there is no modern Marxism, and without modern Marxism there is no scientific understanding of mankind's social life in all its diverse manifestations. Applying with full justification Lenin's description of the objective truthfulness of Marx's teaching to Leninism itself, one can say that Lenin's teaching is an objective truth in the sense that, by following the path of Lenin's theory, "we will draw closer and closer to the objective truth (without ever exhausting it; but by following /ANY OTHER PATH/ we can reach nothing but confusion and lies.

Confusion also results when arguments are replaced by nothing but emotions. It is impossible, for example, to treat as argument the unsubstantiated claim that religion has supposedly enriched mankind with moral principles. It was proved long ago that it was not mankind that borrowed morality from religion but, on the contrary, it was religion that borrowed and exploited for its own purposes certain tenets of human morality.

Marxism-Leninism comprises genuinely scientific, progressive political, legal, artistic, moral, and philosophical views, and excludes religious ones. The history of religion is studied in our country in the context of the struggle waged against it by atheism. Is it not rather too harsh to consider knowledge of religion, the Bible, and so on as a sign of genuine culture in general, or to excommunicate from culture those who would say "the more we please her" rather than repeat Pushkin's line: "The more easily we can please her"?! What should one say then of those who are at odds with the elementary truths of Marxism-Leninism and whose world outlook is confused?!

It is not for nothing that that party tells us to improve atheist education, especially among young people, and to seek new approaches and new ways and forms of atheist propaganda. The attempts to retard progress in this direction are amazing. It seems that there is no point in attempting, for example, to "distract young people from watching the religious procession" on Easter night. [paragraph continues]

Why is it that the poet is disturbed not by the fact that some young people wear a cross, but by the fact that they wear a cross while being ignorant of "the meaning of crucifixion." Instead of giving some thought on how to make Soviet rituals attractive, Ye. Yevtushenko extols the beauty and sublimity of church rituals, which supposedly have no connection with religiousity.

Religion still has not departed from our social life. The "flirting with the divine" by some very respected and esteemed cultural figures has, unfortunately, still not disappeared. So what is so "dogmatic" about the fact that Leninist formulas elaborated precisely for these phenomena are applied to recurring phenomena?

Lenin's struggle against "proletarian culture" in no way meant a slackening, still less a cessation, of the struggle against the incursion of religious culture into socialist culture (which is proletarian in its objectives and ideals), and therefore against God-seeking and God-building [bogostroitelstvo; reference to religious-philosophical trends among early 20th century liberal intelligentsia and Marxist literary figures in Russia].

When it came to prinicpled struggle Lenin did not make any allowances for anyone whatsoever. On the contrary, he paid particular attention to correcting mistakes by those who had the greatest influence on the masses. He uncompromisingly criticized his friends like, for example, A.V. Lunacharskiy and A.M. Gorkiy for their confused world outlook and their enthusiasm for God-building. It is well known that this criticism was only beneficial to them (and to the cause of socialism) and did not in the least damage their friendship with Lenin.

The desire to shield from criticism contemporary writers, particularly the leading ones, that is, those who have sufficient influence on the mass of readers, has nothing to do either with concern for the ideological and creative growth of the writers themselves, or with the education of the mass of readers along the right lines.

The Political Report by the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th party congress said: "It is time for literary and artistic criticism to shake off the complacency and sycophancy which corrode healthy morality, bearing in mind that criticism is a public matter rather than a sphere for serving authors' self-esteem and ambitions." This proposition needs not only to be quoted but also to be really implemented!

In the struggle for clear-cut philosophical stances the party expects to rely on creative unions, public opinion, and literary and artistic criticism. This support cannot be provided by simply quoting party documents.

Ye. Yevtushenko writes: "Thoughts about religion, if they are not of the nature of straightforward debunking, cannot be interpreted mockingly as 'flirting with the devine.'" This is altogether beyond dispute. But the truth is specific, and mockery inappropriate here, because Lenin's formula carries an important ideological charge. In this case, the thoughts of the hero in the novel which Ye. Yevtushenko has in mind give the millions of readers not a "paradoxical perception" but entirely specific impressions. Readers perceive writing as it is.

Criticism without rigorous reasoning can serve no useful purpose. The author of the article "Culture Is the Source of Morality" seems to argue some of his ideas, but in a rather naive fashion. In order to prove, for example, that humanism is not automatically inherent in atheism, he refers to the fact that bearers of the most negative phenomena can be encountered among atheists, while believers did and do include genuine patriots. But what has this to do with the essence of atheism or Christianity?

The article contains a number of correct remarks as regards the fact that education and culture do not coincide or that "the country is inundated with unprofessional people...." But even here, for some reason or other, education (and higher education in particular) is counterposed to culture. Priority is given to instinctive love of truth and, in order to boost culture, a proposal is made to publish the Bible and so on. It is true that the Bible is a monument of the culture of the past. It is, incidentally, published in quite large print runs by the Moscow Patriarchate and the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists. There are also quite a few old editions. In 1973 the book "Poetry and Prose of the Ancient East" [Poeziya i Proza Drevnego Vostoka] (in a print run of 330,000 copies) included Chapters 6 and 8 of Genesis, the Books of Jonah, Ruth, and Job, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs from the Bible. This publication was designed precisely to familiarize people with the aforementioned sections of the Bible as monuments of culture. At the same time, it is certainly worth bearing in mind that church organizations use the Bible as a whole not to enhance people's culture but to firmly establish religion in their minds.

Ye. Yevtushenko writes: "I do not suggest banging our heads against the church flagstones. The source of morality cannot smell only of icon incense or archive dust." Well, thanks for small mercies, so to speak, but that /ONLY/ is highly indicative. It means that icon incense is also a source of morality (?!). This could be seen as a slip of the pen, had the author not gone on to explanations concerning the "single God" in the spirit of deification of human potential, for which Lenin criticized A.V. Lunacharskiy and A.M. Gorkiy.

The party has repeatedly noted instances of a lack of ideological commitment or lack of philosophical discrimination in a number of artistic and scientific works. It has been pointed out that philosophical omnivorousness hinders ideological education work and is capable of damaging creativity of even talented people. Finally, we have to note the fact that our literature and art, which have made an invaluable contribution to the atheist education of working people, have slackened their concern for the problems of atheism in the last few years. And what is even worse, in some works of art in literature, the movies, and painting one can observe admiration of church rituals and a relish for the "delights" of the lives of the saints and elders, church life, and religious morality.

Our young generation is entitled to expect cultural figures to make a fitting contribution to the improvement of atheist education, the development and broad dissemination of new Soviet rituals and customs, and the strengthening of communist morality, which is alien to the hypocrisy and sanctimoniousness typical of religious morality.

DIRECTOR INTERVIEWED ON THEATER REFORM

PM111119 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Valeriy Fokin, chief director of the Moscow M.N. Yermolova Theater and secretary of the RSFSR Union of Theater Workers Board, by V. Buryakov: "The Theater: Time of Change" -- first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction; date and place of interview not specified]

[Excerpts] Our theater is today experiencing a period of sober self-appraisal, hopes, and desire for renewal. The 15th All-Russian Theatrical Society Congress, which was also the first RSFSR Union of Theater Workers Congress, was held recently. The USSR Union of Theatrical Societies Congress lies ahead. Many controversial issues concerning the state and restructuring of theatrical work are on its agenda. [paragraph continues]

Our correspondent V. Buryakov talked with Valeriy Fokin, chief director of the Moscow M.N. Yermolova Theater and secretary of the RSFSR Union of Theater Workers Board, about the significance of the recent congress and the role to be played by the forthcoming one, as well as about the prospects and problems of our theater's further development.

[Buryakov] Valeriy Vladimirovich, what, in your opinion, must be the main aspect of the union's work?

[Fokin] Concern for a constant atmosphere of creativity and openness. The recent congress was perhaps the first such representative gathering of theater workers I can remember that was really creative and constructive. The delegates discussed creative, economic, social, consumer service, and organizational problems and the complex situation of the country's provincial theaters. There was honest, open, principled criticism of the shortcomings which prevent urgent transformations in cultural life. A new spirit could be felt in literally everything at the congress. And the result is that a new creative union, the Union of Theater Workers, ahs been formed in the RSFSR.

The very first serious speeches from the delegates broke the traditional mood of complacency and the usual "peaceful," fruitless course of the sessions. True, some people would prefer not to see any changes. But what is important is that those who think in stereotypes failed to find support among the majority of delegates: In the final analysis the congress highlighted the vital need to radically change the state of affairs in our theater and decisively sweep aside everything routine.

[Buryakov] What is the fundamental difference between the new union and the All-Russian Theatrical Society?

[Fokin] The creative union has a different status and different, more substantial rights: legal, social, and creative. People in the theater believe that the union will serve as a real mouthpiece for their interests and act as their helper and protector, and also that it will have a really active influence on the creative process and bear the main responsibility for the ideological and artistic value of new plays and performances. We already have an example of this kind of approach to the work of a creative union -- the association of our cinema worker colleagues.

The main thing is to ensure that it is not simply a change of name. Both the functions and tasks of the Union of Theater Workers must be radically different. The establishment of genuine artistic independence for theaters and the possibility of living without petty tutelage, "paper" administration, and incompetent directives and solving their problems themselves -- this is what the creative union will fight for. The union board has been elected not to hold meetings but to be of real, perceptible benefit in the questions of radically restructuring the theater. And in this the Ministry of Culture and our union must always be in agreement. [passage omitted]

[Buryakov] And what are the plans and prospects of the Yermolova Theater?

[Fokin] We are striving to ensure that our theater develops as a theater with greater "social sensitivity." Hence our constant interest in contemporary drama. This could possibly be a risk in terms of repertoire, but we are going into it with our eyes open. The shows "Speak...," "The Last Visitor," and "The Games of 1981" have aroused interest among the public.

We are to stage what we consider serious plays by contemporary playwrights -- for example, "The Robespierre Embankment," by A. Buravskiy, "The Strange Woman" by N. Sadur, "Family Lunch at 1.30" by V. Pavlov, and "I Drove Home..." by Yu. Volkov.

[Buryakov] What are your hopes concerning the impending All-Union Union of Theatrical Societies Congress?

[Fokin] I hope that all the positive changes made at the All-Russian Congress will be consolidated and developed. But what worries me is that the new creative union's draft statutes are, in my opinion, an example of conventional, formal thinking that is out of touch with the real theatrical process and its problems. The draft has not been discussed in theatrical collectives. You would think it impermissible today to forget the principles formulated by the 27th CPSU Congress, which urged creative unions to actively manage the artistic process and to establish self-management. But the draft statutes create the impression that the reform of the theater is being carried out not by members of the theater themselves but by someone else on our behalf, instead of us. This must not happen, this cannot happen today.

KIEV COMMEMORATES HUMAN RIGHTS DAY 10 DEC

AU161326 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 11 Dec 86 p 3

[RATAU report: "In Defense of Human Rights"]

[Excerpts] The socioeconomic policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state is based on solicitude for the welfare of man, for the fullest satisfaction of his material and cultural needs, and for securing his rights and freedoms. This was noted at a meeting of public representatives held in Kiev on 10 December to mark Human Rights Day and the 20th anniversary of the international agreements on human rights.

Academician P.G. Kostyuk, Ukrainian Supreme Soviet chairman, opened the meeting.

A.M. Kovalevskiy, Ukrainian Trade Union Council secretary, delivered a report. He said, that 37 years ago the UN General Assembly adopted the General Declaration on Human Rights. In international relations, this document was the first to proclaim everyone's right to life, personal inviolability, equality before the law, participation in state administration, right to work, rest, dwelling, education, medical service, and social security. The day the declaration was adopted was proclaimed Human Rights Day.

Important theses of the declaration, the speaker noted, were built into the foundations of the international accord on civil and political rights, and the international agreement on economic, social, and cultural rights which, adopted on the USSR's initiative in 1966, have fixed the rights of peoples to self-determination and to a free choice in the way of development, and have concretely defined obligations for the states participating in the agreements. Their elaboration and, subsequently, that of many other legal acts was initiated by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, including the Ukrainian SSR. They were among the first to sign and to ratify the international conventions and accords in defense of human rights.

However, it was emphasized at the meeting, not all UN member-states have joined them. This applies primarily to the United States and, in a number of cases, also to its allies. [passage omitted]

In a unanimous resolution, the meeting participants expressed their warm support for the new Soviet initiatives aimed at guaranteeing a lasting peace, and declared their solidarity with all people who fight for their rights in capitalist countries, for peace, democracy, and social progress.

TRUD EXPOSES CORRUPTION IN BOLSHOY THEATER

PM171629 [Editorial Report] Moscow TRUD in Russian 13 December 1986 carries on page 2 under the rubric "The Law Is Binding on Everyone" and the headline "Backstage Affair" a 2,000-word by article G. Tsitrinyak exposing corrupt practices in Moscow's Bolshoy Theater. A. Leonov, the orchestra's double bassist, was reportedly dismissed in 1983 on grounds of "unprofessionalism." However, it turns out that his dismissal was engineered by G.N. Panyushkin, the orchestra manager, in revenge for being accused by Leonov of extorting foreign currency from orchestra members during foreign tours. Unlike others, who apparently feared for their jobs, Leonov refused to keep quiet about this extortion, which continued after he was dismissed, but his appeal against dismissal was opposed by S. Lushin, the theater's general director, by the trade union committee, and by G. Ivanov, USSR Deputy Minister of Culture.

The writer of the article asks: "Do deputy ministers often intervene personally in the resolution of a specific court case? The most experienced lawyers could not recall such an instance." Contrary to information supplied to the ministry by the Moscow Administration for Combating Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation -- that Panyushkin and others were continuing to extort currency from musicians -- Ivanov apparently claimed that the practice had completely stopped. Tsitrinyak emphasizes that extortion took place "openly, without concealment, without fear of being censured or stopped." And he continues: "Confidence of impunity was obviously inspired by certain patrons at the Ministry of Culture. It was not for nothing that they supported Leonov's dismissal so readily." The article concludes by noting that, although reinstated, Leonov has now been dismissed again for "loss of the necessary professional qualities." A letter is quoted in which Deputy Culture Minister Ivanov writes that "the USSR Ministry of Culture sees no reason to revise that decision."

SOCIETY FOR LINKS WITH EXPATRIATES ISSUES APPEAL

PM171517 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Summing Up"]

[Text] The Third All-Union Conference of the Soviet Society for Cultural Ties With Expatriates was held in Moscow on 10 December.

The participants in the conference approved the address "To Expatriates," which states that their mother country remembers with gratitude all those who show it genuine love and respect and try to maintain constant ties and contacts with it. The address contains an appeal to step up joint actions in the struggle for peace, against the threat of nuclear war, and for complete and general disarmament.

There were elections to the society's council and presidium. A.P. Shitikov was reelected chairman of the "Rodina" society presidium.

EARTHQUAKE REGISTERED IN MOLDAVIA 17 DEC

LD171138 Moscow TASS in English 1130 GMT 17 Dec 86

[Text] Kishinev December 17 TASS -- At 1:34 a.m. Moscow time today, the seismic stations of the Academy of Sciences of Moldavia registered an earthquake. Its epicentre was on the territory of Romania. The force of tremors in Kishinev, the capital of Moldavia, was 3-4 points, in the Republic's southern areas -- up to 5 points on the 12 point scale. There have been no destructions.

CSA ISSUES JAN-NOV INDUSTRIAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

PM171431 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 51, Dec 86 (Signed to Press 11 Dec 86) p 8

[Unattributed "Statistical Summary": "USSR Industry in the First 11 Months of 1986" — capitalized passages within slantlines printed in capitals]

[Text] The EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA editorial office has received from the USSR Central Statistical Administration the following figures for the results of industry's work in January-November 1986.

The total volume of industrial output increased by 4.9 percent in comparison with the corresponding period of last year.

Labor productivity increased by 4.6 percent in this period.

The output sales plan was fulfilled by all industrial ministries and union republics.

The targets set for the production of the majority of most important types of articles were exceeded.

Figures for the fulfillment of the industrial output sales plan, the rate of production growth, and the rate of labor productivity growth for complexes and ministries are cited below:

Complexes and All-Union and Union-republic Ministries and Departments	Jan-Nov 1986 as Percentage of Jan-Nov 1985		Percentage Fulfillment of Jan-Nov Output
	Production Volume	Labor Productivity	Sales Plan
/FUEL AND ENERGY COMPLEX/	104	103	101
Power and Electrification	104	103	100.7
Petroleum Industry	103	99	100.5
Gas Industry	108	107	103
Coal Industry	104	103	103
/METALLURGICAL COMPLEX/	104	104	102
Ferrous Metallurgy	105	105	102
Nonferrous Metallurgy	103	103	101
/MACHINE BUILDING COMPLEX/	106	107	101
Power Machine Building	107	107	102
Heavy and Transport Machine Building	105	105	101

Electrical Equipment Industry	106	108	100.8
Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building	106	106	102
Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry	108	108	100.3
Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems	109	108	102
Automotive Industry	105	106	102
Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building	107	106	102
Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production	105	106	101
Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building	106	106	102
Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances	106	107	100
/CHEMICAL AND TIMBER INDUSTRY COMPLEX/	106	106	101
Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry	103	103	100.8
Chemical Industry	108	108	101
Production of Mineral Fertilizers	108	107	101
Medical and Microbiological Industry	110	109	101
Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry	106	106	101
/AGRO-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX/	104	105	103
State Agro-Industrial Committee	105	105	103
Fish Industry	105	106	104
Grain Products	102	102	103
Light Industry	102	104	100.4
Construction Materials Industry	104	105	101

The indicators for production growth rates and for the fulfillment of plans for output sales for /THE UNION REPUBLICS/ (including industry under all-union jurisdiction) are as follows:

Union Republics	Jan-Nov 1986 as Percentage of Jan-Nov 1985 in Terms of Production Volume	Percentage Fulfillment of Jan-Nov Output Sales Plan
RSFSR	104.8	101
Ukrainian SSR	104.4	102
Belorussian SSR	107.0	102
Uzbek SSR	106.3	102
Kazakh SSR	105.8	102

Georgian SSR	104.2	101
Azerbaijan SSR	104.7	101
Lithuanian SSR	104.7	102
Moldavian SSR	105.4	102
Latvian SSR	103.9	102
Kirghiz SSR	104.8	102
Tajik SSR	102.1	102
Armenian SSR	105.1	102
Turkmen SSR	106.0	102
Estonian SSR	103.5	102

Production of /THE MOST IMPORTANT TYPES OF OUTPUT/ for the country as a whole was as follows:

Types of Output	Output Produced: In Nov 1986	Output Produced: In Jan-Nov 1986	Jan-Nov 1986 as Percentage of Jan-Nov 1985
/FUEL AND ENERGY COMPLEX/			
Electricity, billion kilowatt-hours	104	1,443	104
Oil (including gas condensate), million metric tons	51.3	562	103
Gas, billion cubic meters	59.2	624	107
Coal, million metric tons	60.8	685	103
/METALLURGICAL COMPLEX/			
Steel, million metric tons	13.2	147	104
Rolled ferrous metal products (finished), million metric tons	9.2	103	104
Steel pipes, million metric tons	1.6	18.1	103
Iron ore, million metric tons	20.3	229	101
/MACHINE BUILDING COMPLEX/			
AC electric motors, million kilowatts	4.0	50.8	102
Metal-cutting machine tools billion rubles	0.2	2.6	109
of which, with digital program control	0.1	1.2	123
Forging and pressing machines, million rubles	51.4	632	104
Industrial robots, thousands	1.0	13.4	116
Instruments, automation equipment, and spare parts, billion rubles	0.4	4.3	104
Computer equipment and spare parts, billion rubles	0.4	4.3	113
Petroleum apparatus, million rubles	16.9	227	108
Chemical equipment and spare parts, million rubles	73.9	889	103
Industrial equipment and spare parts for the light and food industry, billion rubles	0.1	1.7	104

Tractors, million horsepower	4.2	49.8	103
Agricultural machines, billion rubles	0.3	3.6	108
Grain harvesting combines, thousands	7.4	103	100.6
Machines and equipment for livestock raising and feed production, billion rubles	0.2	2.6	104
Excavators, thousands	3.2	39.0	100.1
/CHEMICAL AND TIMBER INDUSTRY COMPLEX/			
Mineral fertilizers (in 100-percent nutrient equivalent), metric tons	3.0	31.7	105
Chemical plant protection agents (in 100-percent active ingredients), thousand metric tons	27.4	305	96
Sulfuric acid, million metric tons	2.5	25.3	107
Caustic soda, million metric tons	0.3	2.9	106
Chemical fibers and yarns, million metric tons	0.1	1.4	106
Synthetic resins and plastics, million metric tons	0.5	4.9	107
Tires for cars and trucks, buses agricultural machines, motorcycles and motor scooters, millions	5.1	60.4	102
Commercial lumber (excluding small timber procurements) million trimmed cubic meters	19.3	248	108
Paper, million metric tons	0.5	5.6	103
of which, newsprint, billion square meters	2.9	31.6	104
Cement, million metric tons	11.3	124	104
Precast ferroconcrete, (excluding output from subsidiary enterprises) million cubic meters	8.7	104	105
/CONSUMER GOODS PRODUCTION/			
Textiles, all types, billion square meters	1.0	11.2	102
Knitted underwear and outerwear, billion items	0.1	1.6	102
Footwear, million pairs	61.9	723	102
Clocks and watches, millions	5.4	63.8	104
Chinaware and earthenware, million rubles	73.8	859	102
Radio receivers, millions	0.7	8.2	103
Television sets, millions	0.7	8.6	101
of which, color sets	0.3	4.0	109

Refrigerators and freezers, millions	0.5	5.4	101
of which, refrigerators with a capacity of 200 liters or more	0.3	3.4	113
Washing machines, millions	0.4	4.9	106
Automobiles, millions	0.1	1.2	99.7
Motorcycles and motor scooters	0.1	1.0	98
Furniture, billion rubles	0.6	7.6	105
/AGRO-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX/			
Meat (from state raw material Resources), million metric tons	0.8	9.7	107
Sausage products, million metric tons	0.3	3.2	104
Edible fish products, including canned fish, million metric tons	0.4	5.2	101
Butter (from state raw material resources), million metric tons	0.07	1.5	106
Wholemilk products in milk equivalent (from state raw material resources) million metric tons	2.4	28.1	105
Margarine products (from state raw material resources), million metric tons	0.1	1.3	103
Mineral waters, million dekaliters	11	133	113
Fruit Juices, billion standard cans	0.3	3.1	147
Nonalcoholic beverages, million dekaliters	19	370	135

Commentary on the Summary [subhead]

As the USSR CSA shows, the growth in the total volume of industrial output in January-November was 4.9 percent against the annual plan figure of 4.3 percent. Labor productivity in industry increased by 4.6 percent during this period (a 4.1 percent growth was envisaged by the annual plan). Higher productivity accounted for 95 percent of the output growth.

The output sales plan, taking delivery pledges into account, was fulfilled by 98.8 percent in industry as a whole (98.2 percent in January-November last year). The volume of output delivery shortfalls against concluded contracts was reduced in comparison with the corresponding period in 1985.

At the same time, the standards of contractual discipline remain poor in a number of ministries. The greatest lagging has been allowed to build up in associations and enterprises under the USSR Ministry for the Production of Mineral Fertilizers, the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry, the USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances, and the USSR Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry. Contractual discipline deteriorated in machine building complex ministries during November. More than one-half of enterprises in the complex failed to fulfill their pledges to consumers according to the results of the first 11 months, including 79 percent of enterprises under the USSR Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, 70 percent of enterprises under the USSR Ministry of Power Machine Building, and 65 percent of enterprises under the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry.

The fuel and energy complex sectors ensured a 3.7 percent output growth, which is higher than envisaged by the annual plan.

The gas industry is developing at faster pace than planned, and above-plan extraction since the start of the year amounts to more than 13 billion cubic meters of gas.

The coal industry works steadily. Miners have extracted 16.2 million metric tons of coal in excess of plan, which includes 9.7 million metric tons of the particularly valuable coking coal.

The state of affairs in the petroleum industry is improving. For the 3d month running, the petroleum industry workers have exceeded the planned petroleum extraction levels. But the lag which developed earlier in the year still has not been eliminated and shortfalls amount to a significant quantity.

The metallurgy complex sectors produced 2.4 million metric tons of cast iron, 2 million metric tons of steel, and 0.8 million metric tons of finished rolled ferrous metal products in excess of the 11 months plan. At the same time, metallurgical workers fail to give the due attention to the development of the production of highly efficient types of metal products. Just as in the past, the fulfillment of targets regarding the output of cast billets from continuous casting machines, electric steel, high-strength drilling pipes, and some other types of advanced products is not ensured.

Output growth rate in the machine-building complex exceeded the planned level set for the year as a whole and reached 6.1 percent in the first 11 months of 1986.

At the same time, growth rates in November fell significantly, and the volume of output produced was even less than in November of last year in the USSR Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building, and the USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances.

Machine-building industry workers allowed significant lagging to build up in meeting the 11-month targets for the output of advanced highly efficient equipment, and in particular diesel generators for dump trucks with 75-180 metric ton capacity (USSR Ministry of Power Machine Building), two-section diesel freight locomotives with a power of 8,000 [unit not specified] and driven by the D-49 diesel engine (USSR Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building), electric motors of the new AI standard series (USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry), and new generation economical centrifugal equipment Industry), and new generation economical entrifugal pumps (USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building).

The machine building complex sectors failed to ensure the evenness of output production. Just as before, a significant proportion of the monthly program is produced in the last few days of the month. Output in the last 5 working days in November accounted for more than one-half of the planned quantity of spinning machines (USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances), excavators (USSR Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building), and transport [transportnyy] plows (USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building), and more than 70 percent of forging and pressing machines (USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry). This state of affairs cannot but have an adverse effect on the quality of output produced.

As of January 1987, all industry will work under the new conditions of economic management, associations and enterprises under several ministries will be transferred to complete financial autonomy, self-financing, and self-capitalization, and state acceptance of output will be introduced.

The introduction of these measures determines the need for an in-depth analysis of the results of work in the period under review, elimination of shortcomings, and mobilization of reserves in order to create prerequisites for the further qualitative transformation of the country's productive forces and the acceleration of the pace of economic and social development.

COSMOS-1808 SATELLITE LAUNCHED 17 DEC

LD180858 Moscow TASS in English 0855 GMT 18 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS -- On Wednesday the Soviet Union launched another artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1808, to continue its space research programme. It was put into orbit with the following parameters:

-- Initial period of revolution -- 105 minutes

-- Maximum distance from the earth surface (apogee) -- 1,033 km

-- Minimum distance from the earth surface (perigee) -- 995 km

-- Inclination of the orbit -- 83 degrees.

The equipment carried by the satellite is operating normally.

TAJIKISTAN TIES INTO 'ORBITA' TV NETWORK

PM171643 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Television 'Orbitas' in the High-Altitude Region"]

[Text] Ura-Tyube (Leninabad Oblast), 4 Dec -- Color television screens lit up for the first time today in the houses of the inhabitants of the Kulikutan high-altitude settlement located in the foothills of the Turkestanskiy mountain range.

Stable reception of Central Television broadcasts is ensured by a powerful "Orbita" system relay station installed by specialists of the oblast radio communications administration. All population centers in Ura-Tyubinskiy Rayon are now provided with stable television reception.

In Tajikistan, where 93 percent of the territory is covered by mountains, the development of radio relay and satellite communication channels and "Orbita," "Moskva," and "Ekran" system television stations is of particular importance. In order to install them in inaccessible places, communication workers are assisted by helicopters and cross-country vehicles which deliver the necessary materials and equipment. Hundreds of kilometers of radio relay lines and dozens of satellite communication stations have been built on the republic's territory.